DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 244 HE 005 696

TITLE	National Professional Accrediting Agencies: How They Function.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D.C. Div. of Instruction and Professional Development.
PUB DATE	[74]
NOTE	100p.
AVAILABLE FROM	NEA Publications, Order Department, The Academic Building, Saw Mill Road, West Haven Connecticut 06516 (Stock Number 381-12078, $3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); *Agencies; *Agency Role; *Certification; *Higher Education

ABSTRACT

This document includes 21 professional accrediting agencies and presents an overview of the agency; constituency of the accrediting body; responsibility of the accrediting body; procedures used in accreditation; and policy statements, guidelines or principles adhered to by the accrediting body. Appendixes include the organizational elements of recognized accrediting agencies, composition of site visit teams of recognized accrediting agencies, procedures followed by recognized agencies in development of standards and major policies, and institutional opportunity for input in decisionmaking on accredited status. Addresses for each agency are included. (MJM)

ED 093244

NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL ACCREDITING AGENCIES

How They Function

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Education Association
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

HE 005 696

Instruction and Professional Development
National Education Association
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

NEA Stock No. 381-12078

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments 5

Introduction 6

Professional Accrediting Agencies

- Accrediting Commission on Graduate Education for Hospital Administration 7
- American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business 8
- American Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada 9
- American Bar Association 11
- American Chemical Society 13
- American Council on Education for Journalism 14
- American Council on Pharmaceutical Education 16
- American Dental Association
  - Dental Hygiene 17
  - Dentistry 19
- American Home Economics Association 21
- American Library Association 23
- Engineers' Council for Professional Development
  - Engineering 47
  - Engineering Technology 49
- Liaison Committee on Medical Education 51
- National Architectural Accrediting Board 54
- National Association of Industrial Technology 55
- National Association of Schools of Art 57
- National Association of Schools of Music 59
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education 61
- National League for Nursing 63
- Society of American Foresters 65

Address List 67

Appendix

1. Organizational Elements of Recognized Accrediting Agencies 69
2. Composition of Site Visit Teams of Recognized Accrediting Agencies 76

3. Procedures Followed by Recognized Agencies in Development of Standards and Major Policies 80

4. Institutional Opportunity for Input in Decision Making on Accredited Status 82

American Medical Association

Medical Record Administration
(in collaboration with the American Medical Record Administration) 24

Medical Technology
(in collaboration with the American Society of Clinical Pathologists and the American Society for Medical Technology) 26

Occupational Therapy
(in collaboration with the American Occupational Therapy Association) 28

Physical Therapy
(in collaboration with the American Physical Therapy Association) 29

American Optometric Association 30

American Osteopathic Association 32

American Podiatry Association 34

American Psychological Association 36

American Public Health Association 38

American Society of Landscape Architects 40

American Speech and Hearing Association 41

American Veterinary Medical Association 42

Association of American Law Schools 44

Council on Social Work Education 46

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment is made of the courteous and willing cooperation of the representatives of the professional accrediting agencies in providing the material upon which this publication is based and of their giving so generously of their time and advice to the correction of the first draft of the manuscript.

Our thanks go also to Jerry Miller of the National Commission on Accrediting, who so kindly loaned us a copy of his thesis, "Organizational Structure of Nongovernmental Postsecondary Accreditation," which proved to be such a valuable source of information, and who gave his permission to reproduce from it the charts included in the Appendix.

Special appreciation for their diligent and effective work should go to Patricia Sinclair, who did the research and compilation; to Enyd Medas, who assisted in obtaining the necessary information; and to Alease Batson, who devoted so much of her time to typing the manuscript for publication.

—Dave Darland
Acting Director
Instruction and Professional Development, NEA

INTRODUCTION

The improvement of teacher preparation has been a subject of concern to educators for a long time. But there is little input into the processes of improvement, such as accreditation, from the practitioner. It is, after all, the practitioner (the teacher) who is the consumer of teacher education and who must test the quality of preparation in the job of teaching. If teacher education is not adequate, obviously the teacher has some experience and insight to contribute to reform of programs that can be reflected in accreditation.

The teacher has learned from hard—and often bitter—experience just what kind of training *would* be of value in helping the neophyte cope successfully with her or his first teaching situation. It is becoming more and more obvious that teachers—the practitioners—as in other professions—must be involved in their own preparation and in-service training, if these are to have any meaning at all for them.

What has this to do with a publication on professional accrediting? The answer, of course, is that if the practicing professional—especially the one who teaches children—can be brought into the accreditation process, schools that prepare professionals should soon feel the impact of her or his ideas and be constrained to incorporate them into training programs that would better meet the reality needs of the profession. Standards would then be more appropriate and, quite likely, higher. Such an approach should result in a happy marriage of theory and practice that would still produce a skilled professional, but a skilled professional—whether she or he be a lawyer, a doctor, an engineer, or a teacher—with the common touch and the ability to be empathetic with her or his client.

In the process of humanizing the professions, each can learn from the other. Some have already attained a considerable degree of practitioner involvement. Others have just set out upon the road.

This, then, is the mission of the present publication. It endeavors to show the progress made in this direction by each of the professions, so that all may benefit from the example of those that are leading the way. Teaching, in particular, as one of the younger professions, should be inspired to emulate the progress made by others that have advanced further along the road toward professional self-governance.

—Patricia Sinclair
Editor

ACCREDITING COMMISSION ON GRADUATE EDUCATION FOR HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION

HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION

Overview

The Accrediting Commission on Graduate Education for Hospital Administration may have up to three practitioners out of a total of seven members.

Practitioners, by virtue of their membership on the Commission, are regularly involved in the determination of accreditation criteria, processes, and procedures.

Study teams may or may not have a practitioner member.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Commission is composed of one representative each from the American College of Hospital Administrators, the American Hospital Association, and the American Public Health Association, and four from the Association of University Programs in Hospital Administration.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Accrediting Commission on Graduate Education for Hospital Administration is responsible for establishing the standards for the evaluation of graduate programs in hospital administration and for granting accredited status to such programs.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

A study team composed of four members—two or three educators, one staff member, and sometimes a practitioner—pays an on-site visit to the institution to evaluate the graduate program in hospital administration. The team submits a report to the Commission, which makes the decision on whether or not to grant accredited status to the program.

Notice of action taken on accreditation is sent by direct mail to the program being evaluated.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

The standards by which a graduate program in hospital administration is evaluated are contained in *Criteria for an Accredited Program in Hospital Administration*, published by the Commission in January 1973.

Graduate programs seeking accreditation must be part of an institution of higher learning accredited by a regional accrediting organization, or if Canadian, must be recognized by the appropriate province. The program must meet certain requirements as to curriculum, faculty, physical resources, standards, etc., and must have hospitals and other health facilities and programs available.

AMERICAN ASSEMBLY OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS

Overview

The American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business delegates responsibility for its accrediting procedures to its Accreditation Council. The Operations Committee, which is the primary policy body acting within the Council, has one noncollegiate representative.

Standards are set by the member schools of the Accreditation Council. After approval by the Standards Committee, changes are forwarded to the Operations Committee for further discussion and action and, ultimately, to the Accreditation Council for final approval.

Visiting teams include at least one nonacademic representative.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Accreditation Council is composed of Assembly institutions having programs accredited by the AACSB. The Operations Committee is made up of two members of the Board of Directors and the chairmen of the Standards, Undergraduate, and Masters Accreditation Committees.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Operations Committee reviews the recommendations of the Undergraduate and Masters Accreditation Committees and makes recommendations to the Accreditation Council, which has final authority in decisions on accreditation.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Schools wishing to be accredited apply directly to the managing director of the AACSB, who sends them a self-study guide and other material to enable them to complete and forward an application to the Assembly by September 1 of each year. The applications are reviewed by the appropriate accreditation committee (undergraduate or masters) and the professional staff of AACSB. If the applying institution decides, after receiving the results of the committee's analysis of its written application, that it is ready for an on-site visit, a visitation team is sent to the campus. Teams are usually composed of three persons—a member of the appropriate accrediting committee as chairman, a businessman holding membership through his institution in the Assembly, and a dean of an AACSB-accredited institution.

After making its analysis, the team forwards its written report to the dean of the institution and the members of the appropriate accreditation committee. The committees meet annually to review each application and team report and to interview the deans of the applicant institutions. They then submit their recommendations to the Operations Committee, which reviews each one and, in turn, forwards its favorable decisions to the Accreditation Council for a final vote for or against accreditation.

Accredited institutions are subject to review by a visiting team five years from date of their initial accreditation, after which they are reviewed at least every five years in writing and every ten years by a revisitation team. The Board of Directors

is authorized to charge a school applying for accreditation a processing fee and a general fee and to establish the amount of each. Expenses of members of visitation teams are also charged to the school. The processing fee is assessed only once; the general fee, upon each application.

Upon notification of deferral, denial, probation, or suspension of accreditation, a school may appeal the decision according to procedures outlined in the AACSB *Directors' Policy Manual.*

A list of accredited institutions is carried in agency publications.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Standards for accreditation are included in the AACSB publication *Accreditation Standards and Interpretations*, 1972-73. Standards are constantly reviewed by the Standards Committee.

To be eligible for accreditation by the AACSB, a school or college of business administration must offer a baccalaureate or graduate degree program, form part of an institution accredited by its regional association, occupy a position of parity with its sister units within the institution, and have been in operation for a sufficient period of time to make possible an evaluation of its character and policies.

Although certain individual standards involve quantitative measures, the primary concern of accreditation is to encourage schools of business to develop and maintain an intellectual climate that is conducive to the offering of programs of high academic quality.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

THEOLOGY

Overview

The American Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada is now in the process of establishing the constitutional means to enlarge the Commission on Accrediting, which bears the responsibility of carrying out the program of accrediting for the Association, to include representatives of the practicing ministry and the public.

The new standards for accreditation of theological schools, issued in 1972, were developed over a twenty-month period, with input from faculty and administrators, students, members of boards, practitioners in the field, Blacks, and Chicanos.

Visiting teams have from two to eight members, usually all educators. Occasionally a practitioner is included.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Commission on Accrediting has nine members, elected from accredited institutions by a two-thirds vote of the Association members.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The responsibility for accreditation of schools of theology rests solely with the Commission, which acts as an autonomous body.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Schools desiring accreditation of one or more degree programs must first request associate membership in the AATS. After completion of a report form, a member of the Commission pays a brief visit to the school and submits a report to the Executive Committee, which may either propose the school for associate membership or deny the request.

When a school feels that a degree program is worthy of accreditation, it notifies the Association, and an on-site visit is arranged. If the visit results in a positive recommendation for the program, the Commission on Accrediting authorizes the school to conduct a self-study focusing on the goals, objectives, programs, and resources of the entire institution. The Commission provides guidelines to assist the process of self-study, which usually takes six to eighteen months. If the Commission reacts favorably to the self-study, a visiting team is sent to make an on-site evaluation. If reaction to the self-study is unfavorable, the Commission works to strengthen the school.

The Commission may respond to a request for accreditation in one of three ways:

1. Recommend that the school be accredited to offer the designated degree programs
2. Recommend provisional accreditation for a specific degree program for a period of two years
3. Deny the request for accreditation.

A school having associate membership in the Association and forming part of a cluster may claim eligibility for accreditation by virtue of the resources available to it through membership in the cluster or through contractual arrangement with another accredited institution. In such a case, a thorough evaluation according to AATS criteria for clusters is made of the applying institution, the cluster of which it forms a part, and the availability of the resources it claims to have at its disposal. Accreditation may be granted to such a school for two years initially and five-year periods thereafter. The listing in publications will be "accredited by the AATS as a participating member of. . . ."

Various organizations with an interest in theological education but not actually involved in educational programs leading to a degree may be granted affiliate membership in the Association.

Accredited schools must maintain AATS standards and submit an annual report on their operation. Reevaluation based on an institutional self-study is carried out every ten years. Minimum dues are $215 annually for associate members, $350 for accredited members, and $150 for affiliates.

A school denied accreditation may appeal to the Executive Committee of the Association. A board of review will hear the appeal and either (a) uphold the decision of the Commission on Accrediting or (b) refer the matter to the Commission for further consideration.

A list of accredited schools is carried in agency publications.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Standards for the accreditation of theological schools are contained in AATS Bulletin, Part 3, 1972, *Procedures, Standards, and Criteria for Membership.*

In order to be accredited, a theological school must operate on a postcollege level and carry programs designed to educate for the ministry.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

LAW

Overview

A majority of the eighteen members of the Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar, which carries out the accreditation procedures for the American Bar Association, are practitioners. The custom has been to alternate the chairmanship of the Council between a practitioner and a dean or full-time faculty member.

Standards must be approved by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association.

Visiting teams generally consist of a dean, a librarian, and a practitioner or a judge. The number of members of a visiting team ranges from two to four. Occasionally a generalist is included.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Council is currently composed of eleven practitioners from the field being accredited, four educators, and three members (or past members) of state boards of bar examiners.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Council has the responsibility of adopting procedural rules for the initial application by, and approval of, law schools and the reinspection of approved schools. It has the authority to interpret the standards and to adopt and amend rules implementing them. The authority to grant and to withdraw approval is vested in the House of Delegates.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

A university, college, or other institution considering the establishment of a law school or a law school considering application for approval may receive information and advice from the American Bar Association without charge. The services of the consultant are free; the only cost to the institution is his travel expenses. A law school will be given provisional approval when it establishes that it substantially complies with the standards and gives assurance that it will be in full compliance with them within three years after provisional approval is given. It will be granted full approval when it can establish that it is in full compliance with the standards and has been provisionally approved for at least two years.

No formal application is required. Upon receipt of a letter from the president and dean indicating a desire for accreditation, the requesting school will be sent a copy of the standards and other pertinent data, together with an evaluation questionnaire. If the school feels that it meets the standards, it may request an inspection. During the inspection, classes are visited; records and transcripts inspected; the library canvassed; information given in the questionnaire checked; and consultations held with the chief executive officer of the institution and with the dean, members of the faculty, and students of the law school.

A written report of the inspection is sent to each member of the Council, after it has been checked for accuracy by the chief executive officer and the dean of the inspected school. The application is placed on the agenda of the next Council meeting and if approved is sent to the House of Delegates for action.

Provisionally approved schools are reinspected each year during the provisional period. They must seek full approval within five years or be removed from the list of provisionally approved schools, unless this period of time is extended by the Council for good cause. Graduates of these schools are entitled to the same recognition as are graduates of fully approved law schools. Fully approved schools are subject to reinspection every seven years. If an approved school fails to maintain the established standards as interpreted and administered by the Council, it may, after a hearing, be removed from the list of approved schools. Such a school may be reinstated by correcting its deficiencies and complying with the requirements for approval.

A school requesting accreditation pays a fee of $200 at the time of inspection, plus the expenses of the inspector. Provisionally approved schools pay $200 for each annual inspection. Fully approved schools bear the cost of reinspection at seven-year intervals.

A school denied approval may appeal the action of the Council through a provision established in the constitution of the American Bar Association, Section 2, Article IV.

A list of approved law schools appears annually in the *Review of Legal Education.*

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

The standards used in the accreditation of law schools are contained in *Standards for the Approval of Law Schools by the American Bar Association,* adopted by the House of Delegates on February 12, 1973.

A law school proposing to offer a program of legal education that is contrary to the terms of the standards may apply to the Council for a variance, which may be granted if it is found that the proposal is consistent with the general purposes of the standards. The Council may impose any conditions or qualifications it considers appropriate.

An approved school is expected to maintain the level of quality that justified its approval and to provide evidence of a constant effort to improve the quality of its instruction.

AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY

CHEMISTRY

Overview

The Committee on Professional Training acts as the accrediting body for the American Chemical Society. The Committee is composed of nine members, two of whom are practitioners.

Guidelines for the evaluation of undergraduate programs in chemical education are revised periodically in consultation with academic, governmental, and industrial chemists. The latest revision of the guidelines, published in September 1972, contains advice and opinions solicited from chemists and engineers in both the academic and the industrial communities.

On-site visits by a Committee associate are arranged upon invitation of the president of the institution seeking accreditation. All associates of the Committee are scientists and educators from a college or university faculty. There are no nonacademic practitioners in the group, since it is felt that associates not only must be familiar with modern trends in chemical education but also must have a knowledge of the administrative problems and procedures connected with the operation of a college or university program.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Committee on Professional Training is currently composed of seven educators and two research scientists from industrial research laboratories. Three members are appointed each year by the Board of Directors and the president of the Society to serve a three-year term.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Committee is responsible for the evaluation and approval of undergraduate programs preparing students for professional work in chemistry. Evaluation studies made by the Committee must first be endorsed by the president of the institution being evaluated.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

The first step in the accreditation procedure is a study of the undergraduate chemistry program by a group of experienced scientists and educators from different fields of chemistry and different academic and nonacademic institutions concerned with chemical education. The study group works from the guidelines published by the Committee. It also utilizes an extensive questionnaire completed by the departmental chairman that gives information on the curriculum; quality of faculty and students; physical resources, such as library, laboratories, etc.; and performance of students after graduation.

This study is followed by an informal Committee conference with the chairman of the department. An on-site visit by a Committee associate can be arranged upon invitation of the president of the institution. All expenses connected with the visit are taken care of by the American Chemical Society.

If, in the opinion of the Committee, the program meets the spirit and intent of the guidelines and if the Committee's study is endorsed by the president of the institution, the college or university is placed on the ACS list of schools offering

approved undergraduate programs in chemistry. Programs at approved institutions are reviewed at least once every three years to ensure that they remain strong and modern and that the courses as specified in the guidelines are actually given on a regular schedule. This periodic review of programs also serves to provide the Committee with information on trends and innovations in the teaching of chemistry.

A list of schools offering approved undergraduate programs in chemistry appears annually in *Chemical and Engineering News*. The Committee also issues periodic reports on graduate education and publishes biennially the *ACS Directory of Graduate Research*, which lists faculties, publications, and doctoral theses in departments or divisions of chemistry, chemical engineering, biochemistry, and pharmaceutical or medicinal chemistry in the United States and Canada that grant doctoral degrees.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Guidelines for the evaluation of undergraduate programs in chemical education are contained in *Objectives and Guidelines for Undergraduate Programs in Chemistry*, published by the Committee in September 1972. This publication supersedes the 1965 edition of *Minimum Standards Used as Criteria in Evaluating Undergraduate Professional Education in Chemistry*.

The guidelines are intended to offer criteria on curriculum, faculty, and facilities for programs in the planning or developmental stage. It is felt that the establishment of uniform chemistry programs throughout the country would not be in the best interests of the service of chemistry to society. The Committee therefore encourages diversity as well as quality in undergraduate education in chemistry.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR JOURNALISM

JOURNALISM AND COMMUNICATIONS

Overview

Eight educators and five practitioners vote on the Accrediting Committee of the American Council on Education for Journalism. Final accrediting decisions are made by the Council, where votes are apportioned equally between educational associations and professional associations.

Policies and standards are established by the Council.

Visiting teams always have a majority of educators.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The American Council on Education for Journalism consists of seventeen associations in the field of mass communications, all of which have voting representation. There are nine educators, with 27 votes; and fourteen practitioners, with 26 votes.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The visiting team prepares an accrediting report, which goes first to the Accrediting Committee for consideration and then to a full meeting of the Council for final action regarding the granting or withholding of accredited status.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Requests for an evaluation visit must be sent to the executive secretary of the Accrediting Committee by the highest administrative officer of the institution no later than February 1 prior to the academic year in which the visit is to be made. The request must specify the sequence, or organized course of study, to be evaluated. Visits to all schools are arranged by the Accrediting Committee according to a national schedule. Previsit report forms are sent out to the schools for completion and return to the office of the executive secretary of the Committee prior to the visit.

The Committee selects members of the visiting team, which consists of three to six members, of whom one is usually a professional journalist. A member of the Accrediting Committee serves as team chairman. A generalist may be included at the request of the institution. The team prepares an accrediting report, which goes first to the Accrediting Committee for consideration and then to a full meeting of the Council for final action. The Council informs the president of the institution of the action taken.

Accreditation is granted for a period of six years. There is no probationary or short-term accreditation. Accreditation fees are $800 for a single sequence and $200 for each additional sequence, plus an annual accrediting fee of $300. Reevaluation follows the same general procedure as the initial accreditation.

If accreditation of a sequence is denied, the president of the Council informs the president of the institution and the head of the journalism unit by letter and explains the appeal procedure open to the institution. If the president of the institution wishes to appeal, he must do so within thirty days of notification of the action taken by the Council. A five-member appeal board will then consider the points raised by the institution and render a decision on the appeal. After considering the report of the appeal board, the Council makes the final accrediting decision.

A list of accredited programs in journalism is issued annually by the Council.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Group

Standards for accreditation of programs may be found in *Accredited Programs in Journalism*, published annually by the American Council on Education for Journalism.

A program for education in journalism should be located in an institution with a four-year accredited program in liberal arts and sciences and meet certain prescribed standards as to faculty, physical facilities, professional courses, professional performance of graduates, and relationship with the various media in the areas in which courses are offered. The Council feels that journalism is such an important educational force in a free society that the education of journalists should be looked upon as one of the major obligations of institutions of higher learning.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION

PHARMACY

Overview

Three of the ten members of the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education are practitioners and three others (appointed by the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy) are often practitioners.

Standards are established by a set procedure. A request for suggested changes is sent to all colleges and boards of pharmacy and to the American Pharmaceutical Association, which represents the profession. Suggested changes are discussed by the Council and put into the form of a draft, which, in turn, is submitted to eight national district meetings of the boards and colleges. A redraft is then prepared and circulated to all interested groups, after which it is discussed and commented upon in an open meeting.

Visiting teams consist of a Council member, who is a pharmaceutical educator, and a staff member, who may be either an educator or a practitioner. A member of the state board of pharmacy participates as an observer, and a generalist educator is sometimes added to the team.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

Three of the members of the Council are appointed by the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, three by the American Pharmaceutical Association, and one lay member by the American Council on Education.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The American Council on Pharmaceutical Education is an autonomous body.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

A school of pharmaceutical education desiring accreditation submits an application to the secretary of the Council. An initial application must be sponsored by a responsible university or college or by the educational agency or pharmaceutical association of the state in which the school is located. If the Council considers that the applying institution falls too far short of the standards, it may be asked to withdraw its application. If, on the other hand, the school appears to meet the required standards, an on-site visit is arranged.

The visiting team evaluates the physical plant, resources, instructional facilities, organization and administration, faculty, and student body of the applicant school. Following the examination, the report of the visiting team is sent to the secretary of the Council, which acts upon it at the next scheduled meeting. A notice of action taken is sent to the president of the university, the dean of the college, and the secretary of the state board of pharmacy.

Reexamination of accredited schools is made at six-year intervals. The schools pay an initial examination fee of $500. There is no charge for reexamination.

A list of accredited schools of pharmacy is carried in agency and professional publications.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Revised accreditation standards for accreditation of colleges of pharmacy, effective July 1, 1974, may be obtained from the ACPE upon request.

To be eligible for accreditation, a school of pharmacy must be incorporated as a nonprofit institution or be part of a university. At present, two professional curricula are accredited by the ACPE—one leading to a bachelor of pharmacy degree or a B.A. or B.S. in pharmacy, and the other to a doctor of pharmacy degree.

Standards are not meant to restrict experimentation and innovation on the part of individual colleges but rather to be used as a guide in assessing the extent to which a college is accomplishing its stated goals, which must be compatible with the general objectives of pharmaceutical education, as well as with those of other health service professions.

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

DENTAL HYGIENE

Overview

The Council on Dental Education, the recognized agency for the accreditation of educational programs in dental hygiene, has six practitioners out of a total of nine members.

Standards are developed by the Council in cooperation with the American Dental Hygienists Association. The education committee of the Association, which assists the Council in the development of standards, is composed of dental hygiene educators, but the House of Delegates of the ADA, which approves them, is made up primarily of practitioners.

On-site evaluation teams for programs in settings other than dental schools consist of a Council member or representative; a Council staff member or representative, who is usually a dental hygienist; and a Council consultant, who is also a dental hygienist. All evaluation reports are reviewed by special committees appointed by the Council before they are submitted to the Council for final approval. Review committees are made up of two dental practitioners, one dental educator, and three dental hygienists (two educators and one practitioner).

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Council on Dental Education is a tripartite agency composed of three representatives each from the American Dental Association, the American Association of Dental Schools, and the American Association of Dental Examiners. Three of the nine representatives are (or have been) members of state licensing boards.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Council on Dental Education acts as the agency of the American Dental Association in the evaluation and accreditation of dental hygiene programs. The

Council believes that its prime purpose as an accrediting agency is to assist, stimulate, and recommend methods and procedures that enable sponsoring institutions to improve the effectiveness of their program. It also recognizes its responsibility to encourage sound educational experiments and innovations.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

The Council has an annual evaluation schedule based on the elapsed time interval in years between the last site visit and the current calendar year, the graduation date established for the first entering class for new programs, evaluation recommendations from previous surveys that require resurveys before the usual seven-year interval established for reevaluation, requests for resurveys by dental school administrators or the chief administrative officer of the parent institution, and marked changes in data obtained by means of an annual survey, such as increased enrollment without a corresponding increase in number of faculty and other essential resources.

The Council has developed separate survey manuals for the different dental programs. A copy of the manual is transmitted to the institution to be evaluated for completion and return to the Council sixty days prior to the scheduled visit. The visiting committee, appointed by the Council chairman, is responsible for the conduct of the site visit and the preparation of reports for Council action. The committee evaluates special program facilities, including clinical and laboratory; library holdings related to dental hygiene; and program administration, budget, faculty, curriculum, and admission standards in relation to the minimum standards as set forth in the *Requirements*. The Council staff member or staff representative assigned to the visiting committee is responsible for the preparation of the committee report, a preliminary draft of which is mailed to all Council members for comment and approval. The approved preliminary draft is then transmitted to the appropriate school officials prior to Council action.

The Council on Dental Education, in executive session, makes the decision to grant or withhold accreditation status for the program according to the following classifications:

Conditional approval. This classification is applied to all programs in which weaknesses in one or more areas have been identified but which are considered correctable within a period not exceeding two years. At the end of this period, the Council may either accept a progress report or arrange a special reevaluation. Depending upon findings, the Council may either grant a classification of "approval" or place the program on "provisional approval."

Provisional approval. This classification is granted to an educational program that meets minimum standards but that has serious weaknesses in one or more areas which, if not corrected, will result in withdrawal of accreditation. This classification, used for all programs under Council purview, is considered adequate to meet the requirements of licensure and certifying boards.

Approval. This classification indicates that an educational program meets, or exceeds, the minimum requirements of the Council.

Prior to enrolling students, developing dental hygiene schools must attain an "accreditation eligible" classification, based on the evaluation of an institution-prepared manual and a site visit.

The Council periodically publishes the lists of accredited programs in dental hygiene in the *Journal of the American Dental Association.*

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

All dental hygiene programs must meet the standards as set forth in the *Requirements for an Accredited Program in Dental Hygiene*, approved by the House of Delegates of the American Dental Association.

The Council expects an accredited program in dental hygiene education to be established on a nonprofit basis and to be affiliated with or conducted by a dental school or other responsible institution of higher learning eligible for approval by an accrediting agency recognized by the National Commission on Accrediting. The curriculum must be offered at the level of associate degree programs given by an accredited community or junior college, or the first two years of education in a baccalaureate degree program of study.

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

DENTISTRY

Overview

Six of the nine members of the Council on Dental Education, the accrediting body for the American Dental Association, are practicing dentists.

Standards used in the evaluation process were approved by the ADA House of Delegates in 1938. Although revised several times since their adoption, most of the concepts and principles remain valid today.

Visiting committees of five members always include one practitioner.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Council is made up of three dental educators, three dental practitioners, and three state licensure authorities, who are also practitioners.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Council on Dental Education is authorized by the American Dental Association to carry out the accreditation program for dental and related education programs.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

The Council has developed separate survey manuals for the different dental, dental specialty, and dental auxiliary programs. These are sent out to the various institutions for completion and return to the Council sixty days in advance of the scheduled visit. The visiting committee, appointed by the Council chairman, has at least one Council member, a number of consultants with special expertise (e.g., basic science, clinical science, curriculum, finance), and one or more Council staff members. The committee invites *one* representative from the state dental

examining board to participate as an observer and one representative from the regional accrediting agency to participate as a generalist.

The purpose of the visit is to obtain in-depth information on both the administrative and the educational components of the dental education program and to investigate the relationship of the dental school to the parent university. The visiting committee uses the survey manual as a guide during the course of the five-day visit. After the visit, the Council on Dental Education submits a written report to the institution, outlining the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the visiting committee. This report, which is the final document on which accreditation is based, must reflect the unbiased thoughts of the entire committee. A copy of the preliminary report is reviewed by all members of the committee and by members of the Council. After necessary changes have been incorporated, a copy of the report is sent to the appropriate institution officer for factual review and comment prior to official Council action. All evaluation reports are reviewed by special committees appointed by the Council before they are sent to the Council for final approval and action.

Accreditation may be either (1) *preliminary approval*—a classification granting year-by-year approval of an undergraduate dental curriculum for a new dental school not fully operational—or (2) *conditional approval*—a classification granted to programs in which weaknesses correctable within a given period have been identified in one or more areas. Upon receipt of a progress report at the end of the time period (usually two years or less), the Council may either accept the progress report or arrange a reevaluation. Depending upon the findings, the program may then be given *approval*, a classification that indicates an educational program meets or exceeds the minimum requirements of the Council on Dental Education, or *provisional approval*, granted to an educational program that meets the minimum standards of the Council but has serious weaknesses in one or more areas which, if not corrected, will result in withdrawal of accreditation.

A proposed dental school in the early stages of development may receive a *reasonable assurance* classification to indicate that the educational setting, governing body, and organizational pattern of the institution appear to be such that they will ensure the development of an educational program that will meet the standards of the Council. This classification must be based upon a site evaluation. An *accreditation eligible* classification may be granted to a developing dental education program to provide evidence to an educational institution, licensing body, the federal government, or other agency that it meets the requirements for an accredited school of dentistry. For a dental school, this classification must be based upon an on-site evaluation.

Reaccreditation surveys are at present scheduled on the basis of a seven-year interval, although this schedule may be influenced by such factors as graduation date set for new programs, recommendations of previous Council reports, current accreditation status, and requests for resurveys.

Lists of accredited programs in dental education are published in the *Journal of the American Dental Association.*

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Standards for accreditation of a school of dentistry are contained in the *Requirements for the Approval of a School of Dentistry*, approved by the

American Dental Association in 1979. The requirements stipulate certain conditions regarding university relationship, financial conditions, physical and instructional facilities, faculty, curriculum, admissions standards, and so forth that must be met before a dental educational program can qualify for accreditation.

As a part of its responsibility for accreditation of dental schools, the Council feels that it has an obligation to assist in the improvement of dental education programs. The process of accreditation and its self-study procedures provide a stimulus to institutions to strive for continued growth and improvement in their teaching programs.

AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION

HOME ECONOMICS

Overview

Three of the thirteen members of the Council for Professional Development, the official accrediting body of the American Home Economics Association, are practicing professionals. Three commissions function under the Council—one for undergraduate, one for graduate, and one for junior and community programs. Each commission has eight to nine members, selected from both practitioners and educators. Since only undergraduate programs are accredited, the commission at that level is the most active in the accreditation process, with input from the other two.

The commissions recommend criteria for the evaluation of programs at their particular level. Accreditation policies and guidelines must have the approval of the Agency Member Unit (institutional representatives) and the AHEA Board of Directors.

Visiting teams usually have one practicing professional. The makeup of the teams depends upon the program emphasis of the home economics unit being visited.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Council for Professional Development has thirteen voting members: six representatives of the Agency Member Unit, the three chairmen of the commissions, three practicing professionals (one of whom represents the American Dietetics Association), and one representative from the AHEA Board of Directors. The president-elect of the AHEA and the director of Professional Development serve as ex officio members without vote.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Council for Professional Development carries the responsibility of conducting all accrediting activity for the AHEA. It speaks and acts for the Association with respect to policies and procedures for the evaluation and subsequent action on the

granting or withholding of accredited status. The Council is responsible to the Board of Directors and, through it, to the Assembly of Delegates.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

An institution seeking accreditation by AHEA transmits a formal application form to the director of Professional Development, together with a copy of its current catalogue and an application fee of $100. If, after a study of the form, the Council decides that the institution is ready for evaluation, the institution is asked to complete a self-evaluation report and transmit an initial accreditation fee of $400. On the basis of this report, the Council decides whether or not the home economics unit appears ready for the site visit. If so, a visiting team of four members is appointed. A staff member from the Office of Professional Development always accompanies the team.

During the on-site visit, members of the team inspect the physical and instructional facilities of the school and hold conferences with administrators, faculty, and students. The first draft of the report must be prepared by the team before leaving the institution. On the basis of this report, the director of the Office of Professional Development assembles a comprehensive report, which is sent out to each member of the visiting team for review and comment. If necessary, the director then revises the report and resubmits it to the team. After approval by the team, it is sent to the chief executive officer of the institution and the home economics administrator for additions and corrections, which become an addendum to the report. All evaluation reports (self-study and team) are then reviewed by the CPD in executive session. The Council has the authority to accept or reject the recommendations of the team.

Reaccreditation is at seven-year intervals unless a shorter period of time is considered advisable.

If an institution is dissatisfied with the decision of the CPD, it may appeal to the AHEA Board of Directors.

A list of accredited home economics programs is published routinely in the *Journal of Home Economics.*

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Criteria applied during evaluation are contained in Part I, "Criteria and Guidelines," of the AHEA publication *Accreditation Documents for Undergraduate Programs in Home Economics.*

To be eligible for accreditation by the AHEA, an institution must first be accredited by its regional accrediting agency and must have already graduated students in home economics. The primary purpose of accreditation is to provide an opportunity for students to receive quality professional education in home economics and to identify the institutions that are meeting the needs and demands of society in this field. In administering the established criteria, the Council for Professional Development endeavors to avoid any regimentation or dictation. The final appraisal of a home economics unit is determined in the light of the total pattern it presents, and every effort is made to encourage an institution to use innovative approaches as well as to meet accreditation requirements.

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

LIBRARIANSHIP

Overview

In the membership of its Committee on Accreditation, the American Library Association endeavors to strike a reasonable balance between practitioners and educators.

Standards are developed and formulated by the Committee on Accreditation for approval by the ALA Council. Although the Council membership includes library educators and trustees, most of its members are practitioners.

Visiting teams always include at least one practicing librarian.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Committee on Accreditation is a standing committee of ten members appointed by the ALA Executive Board.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Committee on Accreditation is charged with the responsibility of carrying out the accreditation program of the Association. Final action on accreditation is taken by a majority vote of the Committee. To be accredited, a program must receive at least seven affirmative votes.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

The president of a school seeking accreditation of programs must make a formal request to the Committee on Accreditation for an on-site visit. The school then completes a self-study report, copies of which are sent to each member of the Committee two months before the meeting at which the application is to be considered. If the request for a visit is approved, the Committee selects a team of no fewer than three persons, including at least one Committee member.

During the visit, which takes about four days, the visiting team utilizes the accreditation standards of the Association to evaluate the program with regard to goals and objectives, curriculum, faculty, students, governance and administration, financial support, and physical resources and facilities. Following the inspection, the chairman of the team prepares a report. The factual section of this report, which must be approved by each member of the team, is submitted to the president of the institution for verification and any necessary changes. Members of the team take these changes into account as they work on the evaluative portion of the report. Before the Committee takes action on the team report, the institution is sent a copy of the evaluative section and is given an opportunity to respond to it.

The Committee on Accreditation, acting on the report of the visiting team, makes the final decision on accreditation, which may be of two types: (1) *accredited*—for programs that give evidence of full compliance with the standard—and (2) *accredited conditionally* (to a specified date not to exceed two years)—for programs accredited under the 1972 standards which, when revisited, display a failure to maintain standards. Accreditation will be continued only on condition that designated changes will be made. Immediately following the

meeting of the Committee, the accreditation officer sends a notice to the president of the institution and the executive officer of the library school.

The cost of travel and living expenses of visiting teams are borne by the school. Revisits for continuing accreditation are scheduled within a four- to six-year period following date of accreditation.

If accreditation is denied, an institution may file a written appeal with the Executive Board of the ALA, which then appoints a select committee to consider the appeal.

A revised list of all ALA-accredited programs is published semiannually in the leaflet *Graduate Library School Programs Accredited by the ALA.*

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Group

The six standards for accreditation of programs in library education, as adopted by the Council on June 27, 1972, are given in the ALA publication *Standards for Accreditation 1972.*

Before requesting an on-site accreditation visit, a library school must have been in operation sufficiently long to have graduated students and should be reasonably sure that the program to be reviewed meets ALA criteria for accreditation of graduate programs in library education. Standards are meant to be indicative rather than prescriptive. Their aim is to provide present guidance that is sufficiently flexible to allow for future development.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION/ AMERICAN MEDICAL RECORD ASSOCIATION

MEDICAL RECORD ADMINISTRATION

Overview

The official accrediting agency for programs for medical record personnel is the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association. The Education and Registration Committee of the American Medical Record Association collaborates with the Council in the accreditation process. The Committee has about a 50-50 ratio of practitioners to educators in its membership.

Standards are established jointly by the AMA and the AMRA and periodically are revised and updated by the AMRA Education and Registration Committee. At the time of revision, special ad hoc committees of educators and practitioners are appointed. The Committee requests input from all educational program directors and instructors and invites contributions from educational program advisory committees and the membership at large.

The American Medical Record Association has the active participation of educators and practitioners, both as elected officials and appointed committee members, in all professional association activities at the local, state, and national levels. An effort is made to achieve a balanced representation of educators and practitioners at every level of the program accreditation process. Since it is

believed that professional education programs should rely heavily on the judgment of professional practitioners for the ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of educational programs and the quality of their products, advisory committees are appointed, wherever possible, for every collegiate or university program, in order to provide a mechanism whereby practicing professionals and potential employers can communicate with the administrators of those programs.

Constituency of Committee

The AMRA Education and Registration Committee is composed of nine members—four educators and five practitioners—with ex officio members from AMRA, who may be either professional practitioners or educators, and advisory members from other allied health organizations.

Responsibility of Committee

The Committee has the responsibility of reviewing programs for medical record technicians and administrators. It makes recommendations to the Council on Medical Education, which takes final action on accreditation.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Similar procedures are followed for initial accreditation surveys and surveys for continuation of accreditation. In the case of a new curriculum, an on-site accreditation survey is required prior to any official accreditation action by the AMA and the AMRA. This survey is usually scheduled during the first or second year of the operation of the program, when two or three classes of students are enrolled.

After receipt of an application for the approval of a program, a presurvey questionnaire, which is designed to provide an instrument of self-study, is sent to the program director. The completed questionnaire, together with school bulletins or catalogues, class schedules, etc., is returned to the collaborating accrediting agencies a month prior to the survey. The survey team is ordinarily composed of two members, one of whom represents the Council on Medical Education, and the other, the Education and Registration Committee. The AMRA team member may be the director or associate director of the academic department or a member of an appointed panel of surveyors. On occasion, a third member, either the AMRA education consultant or a qualified member of the AMRA Education and Registration Committee, may be included. If the institution applying for accreditation wishes to have a general educator on the team, it may arrange to have a representative from the appropriate regional accrediting commission.

The survey team makes an on-site inspection of the school to discuss the program with administrative officers and faculty members, visit classrooms and instructional facilities and medical record departments, and talk to students enrolled in the program and to the administrators responsible for supervision of practice experience in affiliated hospitals. The team endeavors to obtain sufficient information to understand and evaluate the total educational program in terms of the established standards and the philosophy and objectives of the school. Following the survey, a detailed report, prepared by members of the team, is sent to the institution being evaluated to provide school administrative officials an opportunity to study and comment on the factual part before the report is

submitted to the Education and Registration Committee. The E & R Committee reviews it and makes recommendations to the Council on Medical Education.

Resurvey of established curricula for continued accreditation is done within two years following initial program approval. Subsequent surveys are conducted at four- to five-year intervals, depending upon the findings and recommendations of the prior survey.

An institution may appeal a decision by submitting its objections in writing to the AMA Council on Medical Education, together with supporting data or information relative to the evaluation. The Council will refer the appeal to the AMRA Education and Registration Committee through the Advisory Committee on Medical Education for the Allied Health Professions and Services. If it is considered that a second evaluation by a different survey team is warranted, a resurvey is scheduled and final action taken after an analysis of the findings.

A list of accredited medical record administrator programs is published annually in the *Allied Medical Education Directory*.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Standards for the organization and conduct of programs for medical record administrators are published in the leaflet *Essentials of an Acceptable School for Medical Record Administrators*. These standards, which were adopted by the AMA and the AMRA in 1967, are currently in the process of revision.

Educational programs for medical record administrators may be established in colleges and universities accredited by their respective regional associations. Hospitals suitable for "directed practice" should be available. The preprofessional education of the medical record administrator should include a study of the humanities and the behavioral, biological, and physical sciences. A background in the fundamentals of statistics and research methods is also required.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION/ AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CLINICAL PATHOLOGISTS/ AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY

MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY

Overview

Three organizations are concerned with the education of medical technologists: the AMA Council on Medical Education, the American Society of Clinical Pathologists, and the American Society for Medical Technology. In the accreditation of schools of medical technology, the Council on Medical Education acts upon the recommendations of the Board of Schools of the ASCP, which is composed entirely of practitioner-educators.

Revised standards, or "Essentials," formulated by the Council on Medical Education in Collaboration with the American Society of Clinical Pathologists and the American Society for Medical Technology, were adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association in December 1972.

Survey teams for clinical laboratory programs usually consist of a pathologist and a medical technologist.

Constituency of Board

The Board of Schools, a standing committee of the ASCP, has eleven members: six from the American Society of Clinical Pathologists and five from the American Society for Medical Technology.

Responsibility of Board

The Board of Schools is responsible for the development of new programs in medical technology and for the survey and evaluation of existing programs. The Board makes recommendations on accreditation to the AMA Council on Medical Education, which has final authority in the accrediting process.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

The director of an educational program for medical technologists makes application for accreditation to the Council on Medical Education and completes a questionnaire. A visiting team is chosen to make an on-site survey of the institution being evaluated. The report of the team goes to the Board of Schools, which in turn transmits it to the Council on Medical Education, with recommendations as to the final action to be taken.

An annual fee for accreditation services is assessed by the Board of Schools in accordance with the current policy of the Council on Medical Education. Accreditation may be withdrawn whenever the Council feels that an educational program is not meeting the "Essentials."

The director of a program denied accreditation may appeal to the Board of Schools and to the Council for reconsideration.

A list of accredited programs in medical technology appears in the *Allied Medical Education Directory*, issued annually, and in the sheet *Essentials of an Acceptable School of Medical Technology*.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Essentials and guidelines for an approved educational program in medical technology are contained in *New Essentials for Schools of Medical Technology with Guidelines*, published by the ASCP in December 1972.

Programs in medical technology must either be an integral part of a college or university curriculum with a suitable clinical component or must be affiliated with accredited colleges or universities in which an educational sequence of three years of liberal arts or general studies and one year of professional clinical training leads to the baccalaureate degree.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION/ AMERICAN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASSOCIATION

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY

Overview

The Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association is the official accrediting agency for basic professional educational programs in occupational therapy. The Accreditation Committee of the American Occupational Therapy Association collaborates with the Council in the accreditation process. At present, the membership of the Committee is divided equally between practitioners and educators. Consideration is being given to broadening the Committee to include a larger number of clinicians, certified occupational therapy assistants, and members of the public.

Standards are developed by the AOTA Council on Education (formerly the Council on Standards) and are approved by the AOTA Delegate Assembly and the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association. The Council on Education consists of one academic representative, one clinical representative, and one student from each basic professional, technical, and graduate curriculum.

Visiting teams usually have four members, one of whom is a practitioner.

Constituency of Committee

The Accreditation Committee at present has twelve members, all of whom are registered occupational therapists. Approximately half of the members of the Committee hold academic positions and the other half are engaged in active practice.

Responsibility of Committee

The Accreditation Committee of the AOTA reviews applications for accreditation and makes recommendations to the Council on Medical Education as to the final collaborative decision on accreditation.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Colleges and universities applying for accreditation of programs in occupational therapy complete a questionnaire for review by the Accreditation Committee. A survey team of four members—two representatives of the AOTA and two of the AMA—is then chosen to make an on-site visit. At the request of the institution being evaluated, a generalist appointed by the regional accrediting association may be included. The report of the survey team is reviewed by the Accreditation Committee, which transmits a recommendation to the Council on Medical Education through its Advisory Committee on Education for the Allied Health Professions and Services. Officials of the school are informed by letter of the action taken by the Council and the Accreditation Committee.

Since July 1973, a charge is made to the school to defray in part travel and maintenance expenses of the occupational therapists on the survey team. The school also pays the expenses of the generalist included on the team. Reevaluation visits are scheduled at about five-year intervals.

The chief administrative officer of an institution may appeal a decision by

submitting her or his objections in writing to the Council on Medical Education and the Accreditation Committee, which refers the matter to the Appeals Committee. If considered necessary, a second evaluation may be done by a different survey team.

A list of accredited programs in occupational therapy is published in the *Allied Medical Education Directory*, issued annually, and in the sheet *Accredited Education Programs for the Occupational Therapist.*

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Minimal standards for educational programs in occupational therapy are contained in *Essentials of an Accredited Educational Program for the Occupational Therapist*, revised and approved June 1973.

To be eligible for accreditation, an occupational therapy program should be located in a college, university, or medical school authorized to grant the baccalaureate or higher degree and should be affiliated with accredited hospitals and community health care programs and facilities. The philosophy underlying the education of the occupational therapist is that it must be liberal, broadly based on the biological and social sciences and that it provide a foundation for specialized professional subjects and the required clinical/field experience.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION/ AMERICAN PHYSICAL THERAPY ASSOCIATION

PHYSICAL THERAPY

Overview

Responsibility for accreditation of educational programs in physical therapy rests with the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association, acting in collaboration with the Committee on Accreditation in Basic Education of the American Physical Therapy Association. Half of the members of the Committee are educators, and the other half are practitioners involved in the clinical education of students.

Standards are developed by the APTA and ratified by the AMA.

Visiting teams are equally divided between educators and practitioners.

Constituency of Committee

The APTA Committee on Accreditation in Basic Education has nine members, all of whom are physical therapists. Four are usually directors of educational programs, four are involved in clinical education of students, and one is chosen for her or his knowledge in one of the basic health sciences.

Responsibility of Committee

The Committee makes recommendations to the AMA Council on Medical Education, which takes final action.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

The director of a program in physical therapy seeking accreditation completes an application form that serves as a means of self-evaluation of both new and established programs. The completed presurvey forms are reviewed by representatives of AMA and APTA. A visiting team, consisting of two representatives from each association, is chosen to make an on-site survey. A general educator may be included if the institution agrees. The report of the survey team is reviewed by the Committee on Accreditation in Basic Education and transmitted to the Council on Medical Education through its Advisory Committee on Education for the Allied Health Professions and Services.

All costs are borne by the associations. The only expense to the school is that connected with the inclusion of a generalist on the visiting team.

An institution may appeal a decision by submitting in writing its objections, together with supporting data, to the Council on Medical Education. If the situation warrants a second evaluation, a resurvey by a different team is scheduled and final action is taken after careful analysis of the findings.

A list of accredited programs is published in the *Allied Medical Education Directory,* issued annually, and in the sheet *Approved Educational Programs for the Physical Therapist.*

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by the Accrediting Body

Standards for the accreditation of programs in physical therapy are contained in *Essentials of an Acceptable School of Physical Therapy,* revised 1955. A working draft of "Standards for Basic Education in Physical Therapy," which appears in *Physical Therapy* 52:521-25; May 1972, may serve as a useful aid in program planning until such time as the 1955 *Essentials* are revised.

To be eligible for accreditation, educational programs in physical therapy should be established in colleges and universities accredited by their respective regional associations and should be associated with medical schools and hospitals acceptable to the Council on Medical Education.

AMERICAN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION

OPTOMETRY

Overview

The accrediting body in optometry is the Council on Optometric Education.

Standards, policies, and procedures are established by the Council.

Visitation teams have from four to seven members. There is no set format for the composition of the team, but it usually includes two practitioners.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The president of the Association appoints the seven members of the Council, all of whom are optometrists. Two members are associated with accredited schools and colleges of optometry, and two are affiliated with state boards of examiners in optometry.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Council is an autonomous body, responsible for decisions relating to the accrediting process.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Schools of optometry desiring accreditation apply to the executive secretary of the Council, who sends out a detailed questionnaire for completion and return to the Council. The chairman of the Council then appoints a visitation committee of at least three members to make an evaluation of the applying institution in terms of qualitative and quantitative criteria considered to be characteristic of effective educational programs. The Council, acting on the report of the visitation committee, takes final action on accreditation, which may be one of five types:

1. *Approval*—indicates that an educational program meets or exceeds the minimum requirements of the Council on Optometric Education
2. *Accreditation eligible*—indicates that a proposed education program appears to meet the standards of the Council
3. *Preliminary approval*—granted year by year for approval of an undergraduate optometric curriculum of a new school of optometry, this classification indicates that the program is developing according to the guidelines established by the Council.
4. *Unannounced provisional approval*—indicates the existence of identified weaknesses in one or more areas of the program that are considered to be correctable within a period of two years or less. At the end of this time, the Council, upon receipt of a progress report from the institution, may either accept the report or arrange a special reevaluation. The program may then be granted a classification of approval or be placed on provisional approval.
5. *Provisional approval*—granted to an educational program that meets most of the minimum standards of the Council but that has serious weaknesses in one or more areas, which, if not corrected within a designated period of time, will result in withdrawal of accreditation.

An institution may be approved at the annual or an interim meeting of the Council. Reevaluation visits are scheduled at five-year intervals or more frequently if considered necessary. All costs incurred in the accreditation of schools of optometry are borne by the AOA, except in the case of institutions outside the United States, which are charged transportation and per diem costs of the visiting committee.

Prior to the publication of any accreditation classification below that of unannounced provisional approval, an institution has the right to appeal to the Council for reconsideration. An institution that does not accept the decision of the Council on the appeal may petition the Board of Trustees of the Association for any further action the Board may consider appropriate.

A list of accredited institutions is published in the *Journal of the American Optometric Association.*

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Group

The basic statement of the philosophy and standards of the Council on Optometric Education is contained in the *Manual of Accrediting*, revised 1971.

Standards are meant to be used as a guide; they imply neither uniformity nor inflexibility.

In order to be eligible for accreditation by the Council, a school of optometry must be an institution or part of an institution operating as a nonprofit corporation primarily devoted to educational purposes and legally authorized to confer the degree of doctor of optometry upon its graduates at the completion of a four-year program of professional study. Accreditation is based upon appropriateness of institutional aims and objectives, adequacy of physical plant and equipment, administrative organization, financial resources, faculty, curriculum, effectiveness of instruction, admissions policy, and student counseling and personnel services. Acceptance for accreditation is based on the overall character of the applying institution.

AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION

OSTEOPATHY

Overview

The Bureau of Professional Education, the accrediting body of the American Osteopathic Association, is composed equally of educators and practitioners.

Educational standards for colleges of osteopathic medicine are developed by a review group made up of both educators and practitioners, with emphasis on the educator aspect.

The Committee on Colleges, which serves as the site evaluation unit for accreditation visits and surveys, has an equal number of practitioners and educators from colleges of osteopathic medicine. Site evaluation teams are composed approximately of 50 percent practitioners and 50 percent educators.

The AOA is at present moving toward self-evaluation for accreditation purposes, but this movement is still in the developmental stage.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Bureau of Professional Education consists of ten members: five practitioners; four educators, one of whom is both a practitioner and an educator; and one member nominated by the accredited colleges. The membership includes D.O.'s and educators for the entire professional area, including colleges of osteopathic medicine, internships, residencies, allied health, National Board of Examiners for Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons, and so forth.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

Three committees function under the Bureau of Professional Education: (1) the Committee on Colleges, which is the evaluating agency of predoctoral education; (2) the Committee on Postdoctoral Training, the evaluating agency of internships, residencies, preceptorships, and other postdoctoral programs; and (3) the Advisory Board of Osteopathic Specialists, which recommends the approval of specialty certification.

The three committees evaluate, the Bureau serves as the accrediting agency, and the Board of Trustees is the final approving agency.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Three types of studies are employed by the Committee on Colleges:

1. *Survey*—a complete study of the college and its function by a team of college evaluators
2. *Inspection*—a review study based upon the recommendations of previous surveys, including the specific study of indicated areas
3. *Visitation*—a progress study by one or two evaluators, who interview administrative officers and department heads relative to the progress being made toward fulfillment of recommendations of previous surveys or inspections.

Surveys of each college are made at intervals of approximately six years, unless there is a specific need for more frequent scheduling. Inspection and visitation studies are set at intervals (not to exceed three years since the last survey, visitation, or inspection) indicated by the survey findings and current needs of the college. At least six months before an official survey of a college, the secretary of the Committee on Colleges sends to the president of the college being evaluated a survey form, a completed copy of which must be returned to the central office of the AOA at least one month prior to the date set for the survey.

The chairman of the Committee on Colleges appoints the personnel of survey, inspection, and visitation teams. The survey team is usually composed of twelve to fourteen members—seven or eight educators, four or five practitioners, one staff member, and one generalist named by the appropriate regional association of colleges and secondary schools. The survey team inspects the plant and grounds; studies the organization and administration of the college; examines the departments of instruction, including didactic and laboratory courses, the clinical services, the library, and the research program; and interviews administrative and department heads, faculty members, and students to determine the importance placed upon osteopathic philosophy.

The inspection team reviews specific areas of the college on the basis of the findings of the previous survey and notes progress made toward the fulfillment of recommendations or toward meeting specific current needs of the college. The visitation type of study is limited to interviews with the administration and members of the staff responsible for the areas being studied.

Before she or he leaves the location of the study, each member of the survey or inspection team submits to the chairman of the team a detailed individual report covering her or his area of observation. The chairman is responsible for combining these individual reports into a coordinated report of the survey or inspection. Recommendations are developed by formal action of the team in session. Commendations for improvements made since the previous survey are presented along with the recommendations, and outstanding strengths of the college are noted. The chairman of the Committee on Colleges produces an edited summary report, a copy of which is submitted to the administrative office of the college for comment. This report, together with comment, is then presented to the Committee on Colleges for study and action at its next scheduled meeting. Upon

approval, the edited summary report becomes the official report of the Committee and the basis for recognition and approval of the college.

Any group desiring to establish a new osteopathic college must first conduct a feasibility study covering such points as the number of osteopathic facilities, undergraduate and graduate institutions, and osteopathic physicians already in the area of the proposed site; the annual increase of D.O.'s; number of students entering osteopathic colleges during past decade; proposed methods of financing the new institution, etc., and submit it to the secretary of the Committee on Colleges.

If the establishment of a new college is considered feasible, the Committee on Colleges and the Bureau of Professional Development will recommend to the Board of Trustees that it receive preaccreditation status. If this is granted, the college is ready to receive its first class. The first evaluation of the school will be made within six months by a team consisting of a generalist, two members from the faculty of other osteopathic colleges, and the chairman and secretary of the Committee on Colleges. The Committee on Colleges, on the basis of the findings, will recommend accreditation or nonaccreditation to the Bureau of Professional Education, which will make the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The new college will then be visited annually for provisional approval until the fourth-year class matriculates, at which time it will be visited by a survey team for full approval.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

The standards against which survey teams appraise schools of osteopathic medicine may be found in the AOA *Manual on College Evaluation*, revised 1970.

It is recognized that it is impossible to approach the evaluation of an osteopathic college with too rigid or inflexible a formula, since colleges differ widely in courses and attainment, and excellence in one department may more than compensate for minor deficiencies in another. Emphasis is also placed on the extent to which osteopathic philosophy permeates all areas of study.

AMERICAN PODIATRY ASSOCIATION

PODIATRY

Overview

The Council on Podiatry Education is the official accrediting body of the American Podiatry Association for educational programs in the field of podiatry. At least seven of the ten members of the Council are practitioners.

Standards are developed by the Council and approved by the House of Delegates of the Association.

Visiting teams usually have two practitioners out of a total of five members.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Council on Podiatry Education is composed of seven members elected from the American Podiatry Association, two from the Association of Colleges of

Podiatric Medicine, and one from the Federation of Podiatry State Board Examiners. Changes in the bylaws now being considered will add one student and one lay member to the Council.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Council on Podiatry Education is the final authority in deciding the accredited status to be accorded to a college of podiatric medicine. One of the principal functions of the Council is to encourage the development of podiatry education and serve as consultant on educational programs, facilities, administration, and financial support.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

The chief administrative officer of a college seeking accreditation completes a self-study report, which includes extensive information on the institution. An on-site visit is then made to the college by an evaluating committee appointed by the chairman and approved by the Council. The visiting team usually consists of three members of the Council, a consultant-generalist in higher education, and the director of the Council. The visit, which covers three days, includes conferences with college officials and representatives of the student body, a tour of the physical facilities, observation of classes and clinical sessions, and a meeting with members of the board of trustees.

Each member of the committee sends a statement to the director of the Council, who prepares a first draft and circulates it to members of the committee for review and revision. The director then prepares a second draft, which is sent to the chief administrative officer of the college for an accuracy check, after which the director prepares still another draft for approval by all members of the visiting committee. A final draft copy is then prepared for review by the Council's Committee on Professional Education, which recommends appropriate action to the Council. This action may be—

1. *To accredit* or *to continue accreditation.*
2. *To grant provisional approval.* This applies to a new college before it is in full operation.
3. *To place on unpublished probation.* This applies to a college that has relatively minor and easily correctable deficiencies. *To place on published probation.* This applies to a college with deficiencies that adversely affect the quality of education and that, if not corrected, would result in removal of accreditation.
4. *To deny accreditation* or *to remove accreditation.*

An accredited college of podiatric medicine is required to furnish an annual progress report to the Council. The time interval between accreditation visits is usually five years. There is no charge to a college for evaluation visits.

When Council action takes the form of published or unpublished probation or denial or removal of accreditation, it does not become final until the college has been given an opportunity to file a written appeal with the Council. A committee of three members, one of whom is a member of the Council, is then appointed to hold a hearing at which the college may present a statement either orally or in

writing. The hearing committee reports to the Council, which takes final action at a regular or a special meeting.

A list of accredited schools appears in agency publications.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Standards used in the accreditation of colleges of podiatric medicine are contained in *Criteria and Guidelines for Accrediting Colleges of Podiatric Medicine*, approved in 1971.

Although these criteria are carefully followed in the evaluation of a college for accreditation, the final judgment is based primarily on the institution as a whole. Criteria and guidelines are intended to be used in developing podiatric education of even higher standards, and it is recognized that these are best fostered in an environment that is not excessively concerned with standardization.

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

PSYCHOLOGY

Overview

Of the eight members that constitute the Committee on Accreditation of the American Psychological Association, two are practitioners and one is a lay member. Most of the four educators on the Committee also engage in professional practice.

The criteria at present applied during the evaluation of doctoral programs in professional psychology and predoctoral internships were developed by four special ad hoc committees appointed to review the standards used in the accreditation of doctoral training programs in clinical, counseling, and school psychology and of internship programs in clinical and counseling psychology. A special ad hoc committee of five members reviewed and integrated the reports of the four committees, and the final report was submitted to the Committee on Accreditation for approval at the January 1971 meeting. It is felt therefore that the present criteria represent the input of a number of diverse groups.

Visiting teams consist of from two to five members, one or more of whom may be a practitioner.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Committee on Accreditation is composed of seven members elected from the membership of the Association and one lay member.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Committee on Accreditation has the authority to make the final decision on accrediting by a majority vote of its members.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Institutions desiring accreditation are advised first to complete a self-study to

ascertain if they can meet the standards established by the American Psychological Association. The Office of Educational Affairs makes staff available for advisory visits and also recommends consultants from the field. An institution offering doctoral programs in clinical, counseling, and school psychology may apply at any time for accreditation. An institution offering predoctoral internships in clinical and counseling psychology may submit an application for approval. After reviewing the application, the Committee on Accreditation either accepts it or recommends that it be withdrawn, in which case a full explanation of the reasons for the action is given.

If the application is accepted, a visiting team acceptable to the institution being evaluated is selected. Members of the team spend about two days on campus inspecting the instructional and training facilities and interviewing administrators, staff, and students. Following the visit, the team submits a written report to the Committee on Accreditation. A copy of the report is given to the university, which has thirty days to forward comments to the Committee. If it is considered necessary, a further examination of the institution may be ordered. The final decision of the Committee, based on the report of the visiting team and the comments of the university, may be:

1. In the case of a *new program applying for accreditation or approval*—
   a. To grant full accreditation or approval
   b. To grant provisional accreditation or approval for a three-year period
   c. To deny full or provisional accreditation or approval.
2. In the case of a *provisionally accredited or approved program*—
   a. To grant full accreditation or approval
   b. To continue provisional accreditation or approval for a period not to exceed one year in length
   c. To revoke provisional accreditation or approval.
3. In the case of a *fully accredited or approved program*—
   a. To continue accreditation or approval of the program
   b. To grant probationary status for a period of not less than one year. The association may reveal to the public the name of an institution placed on probation and the length of the probationary period.
4. In the case of a *program on probationary status*—
   a. To grant full accreditation or approval
   b. To continue probationary status for a specified period
   c. To revoke accreditation or approval.

Institutions pay application and initial visit fees according to a fee schedule obtainable from the Office of Educational Affairs. Fully accredited or approved programs submit an annual report to the Association. Reexamination is at five-year intervals, or more frequently, if considered necessary.

A university denied accreditation may appeal to the Board of Directors of the Association within thirty days of the date of the decision. The Board of Directors will appoint an appeal panel, which will make a final decision after giving a hearing to a representative of the university and a member of the Committee on Accreditation.

A list of accredited university programs and approved internship programs is published in the *American Psychologist*.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Criteria applied during the evaluation of educational programs in professional psychology are contained in the publication *Accreditation Procedures & Criteria*, issued by the APA in January 1973.

To be eligible for accreditation, a graduate program in psychology must meet certain established standards with regard to physical and instructional facilities, research, and quality of faculty and students. The predoctoral internship, which normally occurs after completion of the second year of graduate school, should provide an opportunity for the intern to take much of the responsibility for her or his own professional work, with appropriate supervisory support. There should be close liaison between university faculty and internship supervisors.

It is recognized that training models must be flexible enough to accommodate diverse philosophies and goals, as well as individual differences in students. This recognition is reflected in the new classification of "provisional accreditation" given to innovative programs.

AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION

COMMUNITY HEALTH—PUBLIC HEALTH

Overview

The American Public Health Association is responsible for the accreditation of graduate professional schools of public health and programs in community health education at the master's level. A new accrediting structure is at present being worked out.

Under the existing system, the Executive Board of the Association acts as the official accrediting body, with the Committee on Professional Accreditation reviewing accreditation site visit reports and making recommendations to the Board. The membership of the Board is equally divided between practitioners and educators. The CPE has two practitioners out of a total of seven members.

The revised standards at present in use for schools of public health were established by the Joint Committee of the Association of Schools of Public Health and the American Public Health Association. The Joint Committee recommends to the Committee on Professional Education, which in turn recommends to the Executive Board. Of the six members on the Joint Committee, one is a practitioner.

Visiting teams of five members have two practitioners (sometimes three).

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Executive Board of the APHA has sixteen official members—eight educators and eight practitioners, some of whom teach part-time in a school of public health.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Executive Board of the APHA has the authority to make the final decision on accreditation.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

A school of public health or a program in community health education desiring accreditation submits a self-study report to the CPE, after which a visiting team is chosen to make an on-site survey. A visiting team for a school of public health includes an APHA staff member, a member of the CPE, a faculty member of a school of public health, a practitioner from the field, and a generalist. A team for a community health education program consists of two health educators and one APHA staff member. The site visit report goes to each member of the team for corrections and additions before being sent to the CPE, which reviews it and makes recommendations to the Executive Board.

The dean of the school and the chief executive officer of the university are notified in writing by the executive director of APHA of the action taken. They also receive a copy of the final report. Schools that meet APHA standards are given *accreditation* status. *Provisional accreditation* is accorded to a new school that has not yet graduated its first class but that gives promise of meeting the standards. *Probationary accreditation* may be granted to a school with minor deficiencies for a period not to exceed three years.

Each school or program evaluated pays the exact cost of consultation, preaccreditation, and official site team visits. Reevaluation visits are scheduled at intervals of five years.

A school denied accreditation has thirty days to file an appeal and request a hearing. A review board will be established to hear the case and make a final decision.

A list of accredited institutions appears in agency publications.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Standards for the accreditation of schools of public health are contained in the *Interim Handbook for Accreditation of Schools of Public Health*, published by the Association in 1972. To be eligible for accreditation, a school of public health must be an autonomous part of a university and must be authorized to grant degrees at the master's and doctoral levels.

Criteria for accreditation of graduate programs in community health education may be found in *Criteria and Guidelines for Accrediting Graduate Programs in Community Health Education*, reprinted from the *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 59, No. 3, March 1969. A graduate program in community health education applying for accreditation should form an integral part of a college or university that is a member of a regional association of colleges and universities.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Overview

The Board of Landscape Architectural Accreditation, the accrediting body of the American Society of Landscape Architects, has five practitioners out of a total of fifteen members.

Standards are developed by the Educational Policy and Planning Advisory Committee. The policy is to keep the membership of this committee as representative as possible. Its members represent a broad spectrum of various interest groups in the profession—the general public and the client as well as related design professionals.

Visiting teams have one practitioner out of a total of three members.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Board of Landscape Architectural Accreditation is made up of five practicing landscape architects nominated by ASLA chapters and ten educators nominated by the schools.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Board, charged with the responsibility of accreditation of schools of landscape architecture, acts as an autonomous body.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Schools desiring accreditation complete a self-evaluation report before an on-site visit is made. The Board selects a visiting team of three members, which is sometimes accompanied by a generalist. Subsequent to the visit, the chairman of the team circulates a draft of the team report to the other team members for approval. The Board is guided in its action by the report of the visiting team.

Accreditation is for a period of five years. Each accredited school makes an annual interim report to the Board. The required fee for initial evaluation of a school is $1,000. Accredited schools pay an annual fee of $250, with no charge for reaccreditation visits. Expenses for a generalist are borne by the school.

A list of accredited programs is carried in agency publications.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

The Educational Policy and Planning Advisory Committee is at present in the process of developing new standards, which will be available later this year.

To be eligible for accreditation, a program should be a minimum of four years or the equivalent of a bachelor's degree. It should have been in existence for at least four years and should have graduated ten students prior to accreditation. Accreditation is based on (a) the academic intentions of each program as related to the profession of landscape architecture, (b) the capacity of the faculty vis à vis the academic intentions, and (c) the effectiveness of the school in meeting the stated intentions of the program.

AMERICAN SPEECH AND HEARING ASSOCATION

SPEECH PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY

Overview

The American Board of Examiners in Speech Pathology and Audiology (ABESPA) is the official accrediting body for master's degree programs in speech pathology and audiology. The American Speech and Hearing Association has adopted the principle that consumer groups (the public, employers, and others) should have a voice in the accreditation process, but the mechanism for this representation has not yet been established.

Standards are established by ABESPA. Suggestions for changes come to the Association for consideration and approval from a variety of sources—individuals, program directors, and ASHA committees and officials.

Visiting teams are made up of two educators from the field being accredited.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

ABESPA consists of nine directors, approved by the Executive Board of ASHA, at least four of whom shall hold a Ph.D. or equivalent degree. At least two shall hold the Certificate of Clinical Competence in Speech Pathology, at least two shall hold the Certificate of Clinical Competence in Audiology, and at least one shall represent the field of speech and hearing science. At least five shall hold full-time appointments on college or university faculties, at least two shall hold full-time appointments in the schools, and at least one shall be in full-time private practice or in clinical settings other than colleges and universities. Within the near future a lay member will be added, who will be the chairman of the Consumer Advisory Committee to ABESPA.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The ABESPA is autonomous.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

ABESPA has delegated implementation of accreditation procedures to its constituent body, the Education and Training Board. ETB evaluates programs applying for accreditation on the basis of standards established by ABESPA.

Institutions desiring accreditation of a program submit a written application, which is reviewed by ETB. If the application is approved, an on-site visiting team of two members is selected to evaluate the program. If the application is for speech pathology only, both visitors are from this area; if for both speech and audiology, one visitor is chosen from each area. The team prepares a detailed report on the institution, including a digest of its strengths and weaknesses. This digest is sent to the president of the applying institution or her or his designee and to the director of the program, with a request for a reply.

After reviewing all the material, ETB votes by mail ballot to recommend *accreditation* (usually for five years but sometimes for a shorter period), to *hold for discussion* at its next face-to-face meeting, or to recommend that *accreditation be withheld.* The ETB chairman forwards the ETB's recommendation to ABESPA for approval or disapproval, giving reasons for the recommendation. ABESPA circulates the recommendation and votes by mail ballot to approve or disapprove

it. The chairman of ABESPA notifies the institution of the action taken. If approval is given for less than five years, the ETB chairman calls the attention of the institution to the deficiencies that need correction.

A fee of $50 must accompany the original application. If a site visit is approved, there is an additional charge to the institution of $400. Accreditation is for a maximum of five years, at the end of which time an institution must reapply. During the period of accreditation, accredited institutions must submit an annual report to the ETB, together with an annual review fee. If the report is unsatisfactory, if there is evidence of a violation of ethical standards, or if there is a lapse from the standards on which accreditation was granted, the ETB will review the program, and accreditation may be withdrawn or the institution may be placed on probation. If accreditation is revoked, an institution must reapply for accreditation.

An institution denied accreditation of a program may appeal directly to the chairman of ABESPA, who will arrange for a reevaluation and recommendation by the ETB. If still denied accreditation, the institution may appeal beyond the ABESPA to a special hearing panel of at least three individuals appointed by the chairman of ABESPA and approved by the director of the applicant program.

A list of accredited programs appears in agency publications.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Standards established for the accreditation of educational programs in speech pathology and audiology may be found in the manual *Accreditation of Professional Education Programs in Speech Pathology and Audiology*, the most recent edition of which was printed in 1972.

In order to be eligible for accreditation, a program in speech pathology or audiology must be university-based and must be given at the master's degree level.

AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

VETERINARY MEDICINE

Overview

The American Veterinary Medical Association is the recognized accrediting agency for colleges of veterinary medicine. The accrediting function is delegated to the AVMA Council on Education, which is composed of twelve members elected as representatives of various areas of veterinary activity.

Standards for accreditation are set by the AVMA House of Delegates. The accrediting activities of the Council on Education are governed by these standards.

Visiting teams of five to seven members usually include two practitioners.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The veterinarians composing the Council on Education include four educators, four private practitioners, three government agency employees, and one veterinary medical researcher. The educators are selected from accredited schools of

veterinary medicine. One is a specialist in the basic sciences, two are specialists in clinical science, and the fourth is a faculty member of a school specializing in postgraduate education. The government employees represent regulatory veterinary medicine, military service, and public health.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Council on Education acts as the agent of the American Veterinary Medical Association in carrying out policies relating to accreditation.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

During the year prior to a scheduled evaluation visit, a school of veterinary medicine desiring accreditation completes a comprehensive self-study covering curriculum, budget, faculty and staff, physical facilities, clinical case resources, teaching methods, learning aids, and personnel policies and practices.

Visiting teams are made up of four Council members (two from the basic sciences and two from the clinical) and a member of the AVMA staff. Sometimes an observer (often from the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association) and a generalist accompany the team. During the on-site visit, which usually lasts four days, members of the team make a tour of the physical facilities of the school; confer with the president of the institution, the dean of the school, and other administrators; and meet with faculty members, students, and departmental chairmen.

The report of the visiting team is reviewed at the next regular meeting of the Council, with members of the team in attendance. Accreditation is decided by a majority vote (at least seven members) of the Council. Action by the Council assigns one of the following four classifications to each college:

1. *Full accreditation*—for schools that meet or exceed minimal requirements
2. *Probational accreditation*—given to schools considered adequate to meet requirements of licensure and certifying boards but deficient in one or more of the stated essentials
3. *Accreditation withheld*—applied to schools that, in the opinion of the Council, do not fall into either of the two first categories
4. *Provisional accreditation*—given to new schools that have not been in existence long enough to complete the professional program but that have complied with prescribed conditions for the first two years of the professional curriculum.

No charges are made to the institution for evaluation. All costs are borne by the Association. Reevaluation visits are scheduled at five-year intervals, or more frequently, if necessary.

A school denied accreditation may appeal to the Executive Board and, beyond the Board, to the House of Delegates. The decision of the House of Delegates is final.

A list of accredited schools is published annually by the Association.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Standards applied during the evaluation of a school of veterinary medicine may be found in the publication *American Veterinary Medical Association: Accreditation*

Policies and Procedures, Section IV, "Essentials of an Acceptable Veterinary Medical School."

In order to be eligible for accreditation, schools of veterinary medicine must be operated as a major administrative division of the parent institution and must be able to meet the prescribed essentials.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS

LAW

Overview

There are two accrediting agencies in the field of law, the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools. The main purpose of ABA accreditation is to meet the concerns of the judiciary and the bar as to the quality of the schools in which future lawyers are being trained. The AALS, on the other hand, operates as a "learned society" for law teachers as well as an accrediting agency. Therefore, it represents primarily the concerns of the academic community. It also has the additional responsibility of meeting the need of educational institutions to determine whether the holder of a law degree from one school is worthy of admission to another for advanced study or for appointment or promotion in the academic world.

Bar examiners generally rely on practitioners' evaluation through the ABA, and educators rely on the opinion of other educators as to the quality of a course of study leading to an academic degree. The extent of practitioner involvement is therefore much higher in the ABA accreditation effort than it is in the AALS. The Executive Committee of the AALS has no practitioners. Standards are developed mainly by educators. Visiting teams usually have one practitioner.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Executive Committee has six members—two officers and four committeemen elected at each annual meeting from the faculties of member schools to serve a two-year term.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Executive Committee bases its recommendations on actions of the Committee on Accreditation. Final action is taken by the membership of the Association.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Law schools wishing to become members of the Association apply to the executive director of the Executive Committee, providing evidence that they have fulfilled and are capable of fulfilling in the future the conditions of membership as specified in the bylaws of the Association. The executive director may request a visit to a school either upon request or whenever he considers such a visit to be advisable. The visiting team is made up of three to four members, two of whom

are educators and one, a practitioner. The Association is at present experimenting with the idea of including on the visiting team scholars outside the field of law.

The visiting team evaluates the school on the basis of the "Requirements," as given in Article 6 of the bylaws of the Association. The membership takes final action on all accrediting decisions upon recommendations of the Executive Committee, which in turn bases its recommendations on the action of the Committee on Accreditation.

Reasonable costs of visits are borne by the Association unless the Executive Committee directs otherwise. In 1971, annual dues were set by the Executive Committee according to enrollment thirty days after the beginning of the fall term:

Fewer than 250 students	$1,000
250 to 500 students	1,500
500 to 800 students	2,000
800 to 1,100 students	2,500
1,100 to 1,400 students	3,000
1,400 to 1,700 students	3,500
More than 1,700 students	4,000

The Executive Committee can recommend to the annual meeting the censure, suspension, or exclusion of a member school that is unable or unwilling to maintain the required standards of the Association. Action on the recommendations is by majority vote of the member schools. A school that has been excluded from the Association may be reinstated at a subsequent meeting, provided it can offer proof of its ability to fulfill its obligations.

A list of member schools is carried in agency publications.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Criteria for admission to membership in the Association are set forth in "Requirements" (Article 6 of the bylaws) and the "Executive Committee Regulations." Both are contained in the booklet *Association Information*, dated March 1973.

The "Requirements" and "Regulations" are designed to provide guidance in assessing the overall quality of a school and determining whether or not it can fulfill the obligations of membership. They are not meant to imply that formal compliance with their specific terms is necessarily proof of the satisfaction of qualitative requirements or that departure from a specific term means qualitative failure.

COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

SOCIAL WORK

Overview

The Council on Social Work Education is the recognized agency for accrediting social work education in the United States. The Commission on Accreditation, the accrediting body for the Council, includes in its membership two to three practitioners.

Accreditation standards are developed by the Commission for adoption by the Board of Directors, which has a 33 percent practitioner representation.

Visiting teams of three to four members sometimes include a practitioner and a state representative. A revision in the accrediting procedures now under consideration will likely result in the addition of at least one practitioner to each on-campus evaluation team.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Commission on Accreditation is made up of seventeen members, twelve to thirteen of whom are faculty members of accredited graduate schools of social work. The remaining members consist of practitioners from the field and two students.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Commission carries full responsibility for decisions on accreditation.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

A new graduate school of social work seeking accreditation files a formal application with the Commission and submits a report on its ability to meet the criteria for candidacy. This is followed by an on-campus visit by a member of the Commission. After a review of the school report and the one on the visit, the Commission either rejects the application or admits the school to candidacy. In the first term of the second year after admission to candidacy, a school may file an application for accreditation, together with a self-study report. After reviewing these materials, the Commission either rejects the application or authorizes an on-campus evaluation.

The evaluation team, appointed by the Commission, must be acceptable to the school. The team usually consists of at least three members selected from a panel of full-time faculty members in accredited schools of social work and one member of the Commission. The self-study report submitted by the applicant school forms the framework for the more detailed examination by the visiting team, which usually covers a three-day period. At the end of the visit, the team meets with the faculty to state its essential findings, correct any inaccuracies in the information obtained by the team, and answer questions. A copy of the team report, summarizing the findings and indicating the strengths and weaknesses of the school, is sent to the executive officer of the school for comments and corrections before action is taken by the Commission in plenary session, with a member of the visiting team present to supplement the report.

The Commission on Accrediting may decide to *award accreditation,* to *postpone final action* pending clarification and further study, or to *deny*

accreditation. In cases of denial or postponement, reasons for the action are outlined. Initial accreditation is granted for a period of three years. At the end of this time, there is a mandatory review, based on a progress report from the school. If a more detailed examination of the school appears to be essential to a decision, a site visit is conducted. After mandatory review, reaffirmation of accredited status can be granted for a period up to ten years, depending on the amount of time considered necessary to overcome deficiencies or implement changes.

The institution pays an accreditation fee of $500, plus transportation and maintenance of members of the visiting team, and a $40 charge for preparation of the team report.

Appeals on denial must be made within thirty days after notice by the Commission of action taken. In case of an appeal, the Board of Directors appoints an appeal board of at least three qualified members, empowered to approve the decision or return the case to the Commission for further consideration.

A list of accredited schools is published semiannually by the Commission.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Standards for the evaluation of graduate schools of social work may be found in the revised version of the *Manual of Accrediting Standards for Graduate Schools of Social Work*, published by the Council on Social Work Education in April 1971.

Accreditation means that a school of social work meets minimum standards. The purpose of accreditation is not to standardize educational programs in social work but to help schools attain an ever higher degree of excellence. To this end, sound, well-planned innovation and experimentation are encouraged.

ENGINEERS' COUNCIL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ENGINEERING

Overview

The Engineers' Council for Professional Development tries to maintain in its accreditation committee membership an even, representative ratio between educators and practitioners. Participating member societies, which are responsible for selecting and approving their representatives on the lists of ad hoc visitors, also try to maintain this balance, but since educators are usually more available than practitioners to work on accreditation, this is not always possible.

Criteria for the accreditation of engineering educational programs are approved by the Council.

Visiting teams are made up according to a balanced ratio of practitioners to educators.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The ECPD Engineering Education and Accreditation Committee has twenty-four members. Each of the twelve participating member societies appoints at least one

member. Other members are assigned on the basis of number of curricula accredited in their respective fields. Four at-large members are appointed by societies not having specific curricular involvement or the required minimum of accredited curricula.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Engineering Education and Accreditation Committee is responsible for carrying out the evaluation procedure. Final decision on accreditation rests with the Council.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Engineering educational programs, basic and advanced, are evaluated on the basis of data submitted by the institution in the form of answers to a questionnaire and the report of an on-site visit by a team. The difference between basic and advanced accreditation hinges on the recognition of two entry levels to the profession. Basic programs are usually associated with a baccalaureate program; advanced programs are those that lead to a graduate degree. An institution wishing to have any or all of its engineering programs considered for accreditation may communicate directly with the Committee, which will then send out a questionnaire and select a visiting team from lists provided by the professional societies whose expertise relates to the programs to be visited. Members of the visiting committee are chosen on the basis of the programs to be considered and their ability to be completely unbiased. Alumni or anyone with an interest in the institution or program to be visited is automatically disqualified. Prior to the selection of the team, the institution is sent a list of prospective visitors from which it may disqualify without cause any individuals.

In its on-site study, the visiting team employs criteria relating to (a) the extent to which the program develops an ability to apply pertinent knowledge to the practice of engineering in an effective and professional manner; (b) the size and competence of the faculty and the standards and quality of instruction in the engineering and other departments as they relate to the engineering effort; (c) the admission, retention, and scholastic work of students and the records of graduates; (d) the attitude and policy of the administration of the engineering division to teaching, research, and scholarly production; and (e) the commitment of the institution, both financially and philosophically, to engineering.

The visiting team chairman reports the team's findings and recommendations to the EE&A Committee. Reports on programs in chemical engineering are reviewed also by the Committee on Chemical Engineering Education and Accreditation of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, which transmits its recommendations to the ECPD Education and Accreditation Committee. The EE&A Committee meets to listen to the reports and recommendations of each visiting team chairman. A committee recommendation is then prepared for presentation to the Council.

The Engineers' Council for Professional Development, acting on recommendations made to it by the Education and Accreditation Committee, makes the final decision on accreditation. Accreditation of a program is granted for a period of two, four, or six years. Reevaluation is carried out at intervals of six years or less.

If a school wishes to appeal any of the Council's decisions, written notice of its

intent must be given to the executive secretary of the Council within thirty days of the date of notification of accreditation action. The president of the Council then appoints a special committee of the Board, which will hold a meeting at ECPD headquarters, attended by appropriate administrative officers of the institution and representatives of the ECPD Accreditation Committee. Findings of the special committee are reported at the next scheduled meeting of either the Executive Committee of the Board or the Board of Directors, which then takes final action.

A list of accredited programs is published in the annual report of the Engineers' Council for Professional Development. The period of accreditation or failure to obtain accreditation is never revealed.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

The criteria used in the accreditation of engineering programs, as approved by the Board of Directors of ECPD October 1972, are contained in the *40th Annual Report, 1972, Engineers' Council for Professional Development.*

In order to be considered for accreditation, engineering programs must be designed to prepare for the practice of engineering at a professional level. Criteria are designed to be sufficiently flexible to permit the expression of the individual qualities and ideals of an institution. They are intended to encourage and stimulate, rather than to restrain, creative and imaginative programs. If the Engineering Education and Accreditation Committee is convinced that sound experimentation in engineering education programs is under way, it will give sympathetic consideration to departure from the criteria and will make appropriate recommendations to the Council.

ENGINEERS' COUNCIL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Overview

Responsibility for the evaluation and accreditation of engineering technology curricula rests with the Engineers' Council for Professional Development. The Council delegates the carrying out of the evaluation procedures in engineering technology to the Engineering Technology Committee, which, like the other accrediting committees of ECPD, has an evenly balanced educator-practitioner membership.

Criteria for the evaluation of educational programs in engineering technology are formulated by the Engineering Technology Committee and are approved by the ECPD Board of Directors.

The membership of visiting teams is equally divided between educators and practitioners.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Engineering Technology Committee is composed of eighteen members appointed by the ECPD Board of Directors.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Committee carries out the evaluation procedures and submits annually to the ECPD Board of Directors a list of engineering technology curricula that, in its opinion, meet the approved criteria. The Board, through its executive committee, evaluates the recommendations of the ET Committee and takes action on behalf of ECPD.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

An institution desiring accreditation of its curricula in engineering technology leading to an associate or baccalaureate degree communicates directly with ECPD, which passes all necessary information on to its Engineering Technology Committee. A visiting team is then chosen to make an on-site evaluation of the program. At the conclusion of the visit, the ETC chairman makes a summary of the findings from the team report and sends it to the president of the institution. After a review of the findings and recommendations of the visiting team and the inputs from the institution, the ETC sends a list of curricula considered to meet established standards to the Council for final action. Accreditation is granted for a period of two, four, or six years.

An institution planning a new program or one conducting a program that has not yet graduated students may apply for recognition as a "candidate for accreditation." Upon the basis of a report submitted by the institution and the findings and recommendations of a visiting team, the ETC chairman is empowered to recognize the institution either as having "reasonable assurance of accreditation" or as a "candidate for accreditation." At the end of one year, the institution is required to submit a comprehensive report on its status, at which time the Committee is authorized either to continue or discontinue recognition.

If a school wishes to appeal, a written notice of intent must be sent to the executive director of the Council within thirty days after notification of the action taken. The president of ECPD then appoints a special committee of the Board to hold a hearing and report its findings to the Board of Directors for final action.

A list of accredited engineering technology curricula is published annually.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

The Engineering Technology Committee considers for accreditation curricula in engineering technology offered at either the two-year or four-year level by technical institutes, junior colleges, colleges of technology, divisions of colleges and universities, and proprietary schools operated by individuals or corporations. Criteria for the evaluation of programs leading to the associate degree are contained in the *40th Annual Report of the Engineers' Council for Professional Development.* Those applied for the evaluation of programs leading to the baccalaureate degree may be found in *Guidelines for Interim Criteria for the Accreditation of Baccalaureate Degree Programs in Engineering Technology,* a copy of which is available from ECPD upon request.

Accreditation of engineering technology curricula is based on compliance with minimum criteria. There is no attempt to apply unified standards that might tend to force programs into a stereotyped pattern.

LIAISON COMMITTEE ON MEDICAL EDUCATION

UNDERGRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION

Overview

The Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association and the Executive Council of the Association of American Medical Colleges in 1942 established the Liaison Committee on Medical Education to serve as the accrediting agency for programs of medical education leading to the first professional (M.D.) degree. The Liaison Committee is composed of six members from each of the two Councils, two public members, and one representative of the federal government. Appointees from the Council on Medical Education represent medical practitioners as well as educators. Appointees from the Executive Council represent the full perspective of medical education, including administration, teaching, research, clinical practice, and teaching hospital management.

In the past, information regarding a school was gathered from the presurvey questionnaire and from the report of the visit to the school by a well-qualified survey team concerned with medical education and its consumers. However, self-study procedures now in process of development are expected to supplement past and current methods of assessment.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The LCME is composed of the chairman of the CME (one of four standing committees of the House of Delegates of the AMA) and five members chosen at large from the CME; six representatives of the Association of American Medical Colleges, who are chosen by the Executive Council; two representatives of the general public; and one member appointed from a federal governmental agency.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The recognized body for the accreditation of undergraduate medical education programs is the Liaison Committee on Medical Education. With specified exceptions, the two parent organizations, the Executive Council of the Association of American Medical Colleges and the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association, have delegated the responsibility and authority for the accreditation of the undergraduate medical education programs to the Liaison Committee.

The actions of the Liaison Committee on Medical Education and of its two parent bodies are recognized and given force by a variety of governmental and nongovernmental organizations. Since regulations and laws for licensure of

physicians refer to accreditation in a variety of terms, it is important that all three bodies take formal action regarding the accreditation of each medical school.

Approval of a school by the Executive Council of the AAMC carries with it eligibility for membership in the Association and disapproval means removal from membership. Membership requires, in addition to the recommendation and justification of the Executive Council, the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the AAMC Assembly members present at an annual or a special meeting.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

A medical school applying for accreditation must complete the presurvey questionnaire and return it to the Liaison Committee at least four weeks prior to the scheduled date of the survey visit. Each of the major departments of the school is expected to submit data, along with more general information compiled by the dean's office. In addition, copies of the school bulletin, reports, curriculum vitae of faculty members, and curricular schedules are made available to the members of the survey team.

A team for a specific visit, serving as an ad hoc committee of the Liaison Committee, usually consists of four members selected by staff utilizing members of both Councils, as well as members chosen from a panel of medical educators, practitioners, and administrators. Visits usually take three or four days, during which time the team visits the various departments, meets with faculty and students, and, upon occasion, holds conferences with interested organizations such as local or state medical associations. The main concerns of the visiting team are curriculum, teaching methods, staff, and facilities, but the survey also covers medical care activities, scientific research, and graduate education, especially as these have importance for the undergraduate medical student program.

At the end of the visit, the team holds a conference with administrative officers of the school and the parent university. At this meeting, an oral indication is given as to the nature of the principal findings and recommendations to be presented to the LCME for official consideration. The team then prepares a written report evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the school. The report and the appended material contain the essential descriptive information about the school so that the Liaison Committee and Council members can make independent judgments concerning accreditation. Copies of this report go to the chief administrative officer of the college of medicine for comment and correction of factual data, and then to members of the LCME; the Council on Medical Education, AMA; the Advisory Committee, Undergraduate Medical Education of the CME-AMA; and the Executive Council, AAMC. Members of this group of examiners, in addition to recommending approval (or rejection) of the report and recording their opinions regarding accreditation, may make specific comments about the educational program of the school for the guidance of the Liaison Committee on Medical Education. They may also recommend modification of the survey team's recommendation on accreditation of the school.

At its next meeting, the Liaison Committee takes action on the team report and on the accreditation of the school. This action by the LCME constitutes official action for purposes of notification to the school, except when it is placed on or removed from "probation" or "disapproval" or has its status between these categories changed. In these instances, final official notification is given after

identical concurring action by both Councils or action at a subsequent meeting of the Liaison Committee. If any part of the report is inconsistent with Liaison Committee policy, the LCME may record a specific exception and instruct staff to transmit this information to the school. However, except for the recommendation regarding accreditation, the Committee may not change the content of the report.

The Liaison Committee on Medical Education has several options regarding accreditation of developed schools: (a) full approval for seven years for a specified number of students; (b) approval for a term limited to a stated number of years for a specified number of students, and/or (c) the requirement of submission of progress reports concerning certain problems; (d) probation (requiring published acknowledgment that accreditation of the school is in jeopardy); and (e) disapproval.

For a developing school, options include provisional approval, which implies some assurance of eventual accreditation during the stage of development until the first class is graduated. The LCME can also reject a school's request for provisional approval and defer it for later consideration. Federal agencies frequently request a letter of "reasonable assurance," indicating the probability that the school will be fully accredited when it graduates its first class. (This is essentially preaccreditation and may be combined with provisional approval.) In future, the LCME will assess the school a fee for a formal preaccreditation visit.

Staff consultation is provided as a public service to a new school during the early stage of development. All costs of consultation, evaluation, and reaccreditation of programs of medical education leading to the M.D. degree are borne by the two parent organizations. Reaccreditation visits for fully approved schools are usually scheduled at seven-year intervals in the United States (five years for Canadian schools), but more frequently if the LCME so determines.

An adverse accrediting decision may be appealed by a school to the LCME and reviewed by an appeals board according to an established policy that defines the process.

A list of accredited schools is published yearly in the education number of the *Journal of the American Medical Association* and in the AAMC *Directory of American Medical Education.*

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

A statement of general standards and policies used in the accreditation of schools of medicine may be found in *Functions and Structure of a Medical School,* approved in 1972-73. An appendix, *Programs in the Basic Medical Sciences,* has been adopted by the LCME and received further consideration by parent associations during 1973.

NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD

ARCHITECTURE

Overview

Of the eleven members of the National Architectural Accrediting Board, seven are practitioners and two are students.

Policies and procedures are set by the Board at its annual meeting.

The percentage of practitioners on visitation teams ranges from 50 to 75.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The National Architectural Accrediting Board includes two directors nominated by the American Institute of Architects, two by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, and two by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture; two representatives of allied professions; one representative of general education; and two students.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Board is an autonomous agency. According to the founding agreement, the Board is directed to "make and adopt rules and regulations to facilitate and determine its procedures and operations."

Procedures Used in Accreditation

A school of architecture desiring accreditation submits an application form provided by the Board and signed by an officer of the institution. The secretary of the Board then sends out a self-evaluation report form to be completed by the school. A tentative visiting committee is chosen for each school, composed of at least one Board member as chairman, one representative from the American Institute of Architects, one from the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, one from the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, and one undergraduate or recently graduated student of architecture. If the school so desires, a generalist from the appropriate regional association is also appointed to the team. After the proposed team roster has been submitted to the head of the school for review and any necessary changes, a date is set for the visit.

Each member of the visiting team receives a copy of the school evaluation report, the current catalogue of the school, and a checklist of nineteen items to be observed, together with a copy of the Board's previous report on the school. The visit includes a meeting with the head of the school to review the evaluation report, an initial meeting with the president of the institution, a survey of the physical plant, visits with members of the faculty, a meeting with a representative group of students, and a final meeting with the president to discuss general observations of the team.

Subsequent to the visit, the chairman prepares a draft of the team report and circulates it to the various members for approval. Within thirty days, he transmits a copy of the approved draft, signed by each member of the team, to the Board for its guidance in the determination of accreditation. The Board considers the team report at its interim meeting, edits and approves it, and takes tentative action on its recommendations. The Board then sends the approved report to the chief administrative officer of the school and advises her or him of its tentative

action. Final action is taken at the annual meeting of the Board a few weeks later.

Accreditation may be for a five-year or a shorter period. The Board requires each accredited school to complete an annual interim report on significant changes occurring at the school during the year. A $1,000 fee is now charged for initial accreditation. The matter of payments by schools is currently under revision.

The 1940 agreement establishing the Board states that the decision of the Board is final and not subject to review or appeal by any of the three organizations that created it. Consequently, no separate appeal body has been formally established. However, schools have always been given an opportunity between the interim and annual meetings to question the Board's anticipated action.

A list of accredited schools is published annually by the Board.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

In its *Statement of Policy*, the National Architectural Accrediting Board sets forth in general terms the principles to be followed during evaluation and describes briefly the six areas (purpose and clientele, organization, faculty, students, plant, and budget) to be examined.

In order to be eligible for accreditation, a school of architecture must be legally authorized to confer degrees or to issue a certificate covering an architectural course considered by the Board to be equivalent to that included in the normal curriculum of a degree-granting institution. The school must also have been in operation long enough to make an objective evaluation possible. A school of architecture is judged on the basis of the total pattern it presents. Wide variations are to be expected, and superiority in one department may compensate to some extent for deficiencies in another. Each school is judged according to its announced objectives and the purposes it purports to serve.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY

TECHNOLOGY

Overview

In April 1973, the National Association of Industrial Technology was granted the authority to accredit industrial technology programs. The Association delegates responsibility for accreditation procedures and implementation to the NAIT National Board of Accreditation. Since the NAIT membership consists of both industrial professional and university faculty, it is impossible for all twelve members of the Board to be practitioners. It is anticipated that the number will vary from 30 to 60 percent. In no case will there be fewer than two members from industry.

Six regional accreditation chairmen are selected by the NAIT president from an "Eligibility List for Accreditation Visiting Team Members." These chairmen are assigned to regions other than the one in which they reside and report to the chairman of the NAIT National Board of Accreditation. In addition to being

responsible for all aspects of NAIT accreditation in his region, the regional accreditation chairman also serves as chairman of each visiting team in his region. Visiting teams include, in addition to the regional chairman, two to three other members, one of whom must be an industrial technologist.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The design of the NAIT National Board of Accreditation calls for a geographic and professional distribution of members. The Board includes the directors from the NAIT's six regions, two members from industry, two appointed by an outside professional organization, the junior member of the NAIT Board of Trustees, and the chairman of the NAIT Standards and Accreditation Committee.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The NAIT National Board of Accreditation has final authority in decisions on accreditation.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

To start the accreditation process, an institution makes a request for accreditation of its program in industrial technology to the president of NAIT at least three months before the anticipated visit. A visiting team is then appointed and guidelines are sent to the department chairman for use in the completion of a report, which must be in the hands of the team chairman for distribution to team members one month in advance of the visit.

During a two-day visit, the visiting team inspects the physical plant, tours the labs and classrooms, studies curriculum outlines, and interviews administrators, faculty, and students. Before leaving campus, the team chairman makes an informal verbal report to the highest administrative officer and the department chairman. Within a week following the visit, he edits the report and circulates it to the other members of the team for review and correction, after which it is sent to the department chairman for review and correction of factual data. The team chairman then edits a final draft of the confidential report and mails it to the president of the institution and the National Accreditation Chairman. The National Board of Accreditation, at its next meeting, reviews and acts upon the report. At the time of review, the president of the institution is given an opportunity to comment on the report in the presence of the chairman of the visiting team or his representative. The Board, if it sees fit, may take action contrary to the recommendations of the visiting team.

Initial accreditation may be for one, two, or four years, depending upon existing conditions as reported by the visiting team. Accreditation renewal, based upon revisitation, may be for one, two, four, or six years, with the most frequent period being four years. In cases of nonapproval, reapplication for accreditation may be made after one year.

The total cost of accreditation, which is borne by the institution, consists of the actual expenses of the visiting team and a standard accreditation fee as stipulated in the NAIT bylaws. Revisitation fees are determined similarly.

The chief administrative officer of an institution may appeal an accreditation decision to the president of NAIT, who then calls a meeting of the Appeals Board to consider the complaint. The Appeals Board consists of three members elected

by the NAIT membership, one appointed from industry, one appointed annually by the NAIT president, and the senior member of the NAIT Board of Trustees.

A list of accredited programs appears in the NAIT Annual Report.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Standards applied in the evaluation of a program in industrial technology are contained in the pamphlet *Standards and Guidelines for the Accreditation of Baccalaureate Industrial Technology Programs.*

To be eligible for accreditation, an educational program in industrial technology must terminate in the baccalaureate degree. The primary purpose of accreditation is to recognize the attainment of certain professional standards by institutions offering programs in industrial technology and to encourage others to strive to meet these standards.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF ART

ART

Overview

In recent years, the National Association of Schools of Art has extended membership, and in some cases accreditation, to institutions other than those offering four-year professionally oriented programs in art. Three types of membership are offered:

Division I comprises schools offering professional programs of art and design that prepare students at the college or graduate level for careers as designers, painters, sculptors, or teachers of art and that lead to the B.F.A. or M.F.A. degree.

Division II provides accredited status to interested liberal arts colleges offering major studies in art that normally lead to the B.A., M.A., or similar degree.

Division III offers an opportunity for membership to schools whose objectives are consistent with those of the Association that may not wish to be accredited but want to retain the option of seeking accreditation at a later date.

Officers of NASA and members of the Commission on Accrediting and visiting teams are drawn from representatives of member schools. Consequently, viewed in one way, it can be said that no practitioners are included in the accreditation process. However, since most art faculty members are also practicing artists or designers, NASA tends to look upon them as practitioners as well as educators.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Commission on Accrediting, the recognized accrediting agency for the National Association of Schools of Art, is composed of seven educators and one lay member.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Commission on Accrediting is responsible for carrying out the accreditation procedures of the Association. Action of the Commission on evaluation reports submitted by visiting teams must be ratified by the Board of Directors of the Association.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

After submitting an application form and paying the required application fee, schools seeking accreditation complete an evaluation self-study and return it to the director of the Commission on Accrediting. The director schedules visits to applicant schools and member schools to be reaccredited on the basis of (a) graduation date of the first entering class for new programs, (b) elapsed interval in years since the last on-site visit, (c) recommendations from previous accreditation reports that may require a special revisit prior to the normal ten-year period, and (d) requests by member schools for revisits.

The director of the Commission appoints an evaluation team of two or three educators from the field being accredited. A generalist designated by a regional accrediting association may also be included at the request of the institution. Copies of the team report, together with the review of the visited institution, are sent by the director to each of the members of the Commission. The recommendations of the Commission are presented to the Board of Directors at their next regularly scheduled meeting.

Applicant schools are informed of the action by the Board within ten days. Following the announcement of acceptance into Association membership, an applicant school has a maximum of one year in which to accept the invitation. Schools considered deserving of accredited membership upon the fulfillment of certain conditions may be granted *provisional membership*, with a provision that they be revisited within two to five years. Schools found deficient by the Board of Directors but considered worthy of continued membership are placed on *probation* for a period of two to three years to provide time for them to correct their deficiencies, at which time they may request a revisit. If a school is found deficient after a revisit, the Board of Directors may *terminate* accredited status. In such a case, the school may continue as a Division III member and is encouraged to reapply for accredited status after deficiencies have been corrected.

A fee of $100 must accompany the school's application for accreditation, and the costs of the visit must be defrayed by the school. Annual dues for Division I members are $300, and $100 for Division II members. Schools applying for membership in Division III pay a $75 application fee and membership dues of $75 per year. Reaccreditation visits are scheduled at ten-year intervals. Reaccreditation fees for both Division I and Division II members are $100, plus expenses.

If the Commission on Accrediting recommends rejection for membership in the Association, the chief administrative officer of the school is advised of this action at least thirty days in advance of a Board meeting preceding the annual meeting. The chief administrative officer or her or his representative is invited to appear before the Board and present her or his views.

A list of accredited schools is published annually by the Association.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Group

Criteria for accreditation are contained in NASA *Handbook for Admissions and Accreditation Procedures*, revised December 1971.

All schools and institutions seeking membership in NASA must be organized on a nonprofit basis. Two-year as well as four-year colleges are eligible for membership. Major emphasis is placed on the quality of the creative experiences that occur in the studio. Schools in Division I stress studio experiences and related technical studies by allocating to them a majority of credits toward a degree. Those in Division II usually offer studio courses as a major in the liberal arts curriculum. Specifically, the evaluation and accreditation of schools of art and design can be based only upon the announced objectives of an individual school as they relate to standards for accreditation generally characteristic of institutions of higher learning, the comprehensive presentation of the educational philosophy and concepts that determine these objectives, and the degree to which the objectives have been successfully implemented and attained. Although examiners keep in mind common standards, such as financial stability, quality of faculty, facilities and resources, and teaching schedules, they recognize that an evaluation of the creative arts, which are themselves based on subjective experiences, must also be largely subjective. Conformity to a preestablished pattern is neither sought nor desired.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

MUSIC

Overview

The review groups for accreditation in the National Association of Schools of Music are the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Commission on Graduate Studies. In the strict sense of the word, neither Commission at present includes practitioners in its membership. It should be recognized, however, that in the arts the distinction between practitioner and teacher is difficult, as most teachers are also practitioners, and most practitioners are also teachers.

Standards for undergraduate degrees and recommendations for graduate study in music are developed through the commissions and special committees but are voted upon for adoption by the entire membership.

Visiting teams consist of one or two members, both of whom are educators.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Commission on Graduate Studies have seven members each, elected by the membership at large of the Association to serve for a term of three years. The chairmen of the Commissions may be elected to serve an additional term.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The two Commissions are responsible for carrying out accreditation procedures and recommending action to the Board of Directors of the Association and the membership.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Schools of music desiring accreditation make formal application to the executive secretary of the Association. Associate membership is granted to institutions that meet a substantial portion of the standards of the Association and give promise of being able to meet them completely. All applicant institutions are placed in the associate membership category for a minimum period of two years and are expected to apply within five years for promotion to full membership.

An application for associate membership, promotion to full membership, or revisitation must be accompanied by the payment of a fee, scaled as follows:

Junior colleges	$200, plus examiner's expenses
Schools offering the baccalaureate	$200, plus examiner's expenses
Schools offering the master's	$250, plus examiner's expenses
Schools offering the doctorate	$300, plus examiner's expenses

A reexamination of full member schools is scheduled at ten-year intervals. Member schools that fail to maintain required standards may have their membership suspended or revoked by vote of the Association on the recommendation of the appropriate commission or committee and the Board of Directors. Such schools may apply for reinstatement through the usual admission procedure after the lapse of two years.

The Association provides for appeal procedures as approved by the National Commission on Accrediting.

A list of accredited schools is carried in the NASM *Directory*, issued annually.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Criteria for membership in the Association are stated in the bylaws of the Association, contained in the NASM *Handbook 1972*. Membership is granted only when the total curricular offerings of the applicant institution meet Association standards.

Criteria used in the accreditation of schools of music have been developed for the purpose of establishing standards of achievement. They are not intended to restrict the freedom of a school to develop new ideas or to conduct experimentation.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

TEACHER EDUCATION

Overview

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education is a national body of representative educators created for the purpose of accrediting teacher education programs in colleges and universities in the United States. Governance, financial, and membership support comes from the five original constituent organizations (the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the National Education Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National School Boards Association, and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification) that created NCATE in 1954 and have maintained its operation since that time. Communication with and surveillance by the constituent organizations are by means of a coordinating board, the members of which are appointed by the constituent organizations. Following a year of intensive negotiations, the membership of the coordinating board will undergo a change such that the membership will be as follows: AACTE, 6; NEA, 6; CCSSO, 1; NASDTEC, 1; NSBA, 1; and three others yet to be determined.

The standards applied by the Council in its accreditation activities were developed by a Commission on Standards appointed by AACTE as provided in the constitution. The last major revision of standards was carried out during the period 1967-70 by a commission of ten members, one of whom was a practicing high school teacher. The revised standards were adopted in January 1970. Future evaluation, development, and revision of standards will be by a committee of the NCATE.

Visiting teams ordinarily include six to eleven members, depending on the complexity of the accreditation request, but they may be larger upon request of the institution being evaluated. Policies adopted by the Council ensure the inclusion of minority representatives, women, and public school practitioners on all regular teams. Each team must have at least two practitioners, one of whom is a classroom teacher.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The membership of the council will also change as a result of recent negotiations. It will total 24 members as follows: AACTE, 8; NEA, 8; CCSSO, 1; NASDTEC, 1; NSBA, 1; and five others yet to be determined.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

NCATE has final authority in decisions on accreditation.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

After indicating its desire for accreditation of a teacher education program, an institution prepares a self-study report and submits it with supporting data to the Council. A visiting team acceptable to the institution is chosen to make an on-site visit. Prior to the visit, the chairman of the team goes to the campus for a preliminary conference and to make a check on the data submitted. Members of the team spend three or four days on campus, during which time they validate the

self-study report, examine the program in terms of the standards, and arrive at a consensus as to its quality. The visiting team chairman prepares an initial draft of the report of the team and submits it to each member for correction. The chairman then prepares a final draft, which is submitted to the NCATE office and to the institution.

The report of the visiting team, together with the institutional report, goes to an evaluation board panel comprised of eight members and a chairman. The selection of members for each board is governed by Council policies relating to minority representation; inclusion of women; involvement of practitioners, including classroom teachers; geographical representation; and institutional representation by type of institution. After a period of study at home, boards meet to discuss and evaluate approximately a dozen institutions in a three-day period. After interviewing the team chairman and representatives from the institution, the board prepares a recommendation for accreditation, which goes to the Council in writing a month before its meeting. Each board chairman appears in person before the Council to discuss each recommendation, and a member of the Council serves on each evaluation board to increase communications both ways between Council and board. The disposition of each accreditation case is based on well-defined policies that set forth the options open to the Council.

Initial accreditation of a program is usually granted for a period of five years. Reaccreditation is normally extended on a ten-year cycle. Institutions are charged an accreditation fee at the time of the visit. Fees are graduated according to the complexity of programs and degree levels at the institution. The college and university portion of financial support for the Council comes from annual dues paid by institutions for membership in AACTE, which transfers a proportion of these dues to NCATE. Institutions not belonging to AACTE pay a yearly fee—again graduated in terms of programs and degree levels—directly to the Council. Other costs to the institution include the expenses of the visiting team and incidental expenses related to the writing of the institutional accreditation report.

An institution denied accreditation may bring its case before the Council through established due process activities. If it still feels that it has not received a just decision, it may bring its case before an appeals board outside the Council structure. Policies defining the duties of this board are printed in the bylaws to the constitution.

A list of accredited institutions is published annually by NCATE.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Standards applied to the evaluation of programs in teacher education are published by NCATE as *Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.* They are divided into two parts: one dealing with basic teacher education programs (preservice at the baccalaureate or master's degree level), and the other with advanced programs (applied to all programs, whether for teachers or school service personnel, at advanced degree levels).

To be eligible for an accreditation evaluation, an institution must be regionally accredited and hold state approval for offering the program for which accreditation is sought, and the program must have been in operation sufficiently long to have graduated enough students to make an evaluation of its products possible. The

standards applied to programs are looked upon as the minimum for acceptability. The Council urges institutions to set for themselves higher standards and to work constantly toward better ways of preparing teachers. Realizing that accreditation may sometimes have an inhibiting effect on change, the Council attempts to make it clear that it respects creativity and will seek ways to evaluate new programs that may deviate from standard.

NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR NURSING

NURSING

Overview

The Board of Directors of the National League for Nursing delegates responsibility for accreditation to four councils: Council of Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs, Council of Diploma Programs, Council of Associate Degree Programs, and Council of Practical Nursing Programs. Members of the Councils, who are both educators and practitioners, serve on the Board of Review and the visiting teams.

Faculties of educational units in nursing play the major role in the accreditation process. They establish policies and practices for their individual programs and determine the goals for the overall development of nursing education.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Board of Review for Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs has nine members; each of the other three has seven. Membership in the Councils is open to educational units, divisions, and departments conducting programs in nursing education.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

Each of the councils is responsible for the development and improvement of the educational program in its particular field. The councils act as autonomous bodies in the establishment of standards and accrediting procedures and in the appointment of boards of review, which make the final decision on accreditation.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

Institutions offering programs in nursing apply to the council responsible for accreditation of that particular program. They then complete a self-evaluation report, based on the accepted criteria of the council. This report becomes the primary document used by the board of review in the evaluation of the program.

A visiting team of two or more members is selected to make an on-site visit. Through conferences with faculty and students, visits to educational and clinical facilities where students are having educational experiences, and review of materials and records, the visiting team clarifies, verifies, and amplifies the

self-evaluation report submitted by the institution. Upon completion of the survey, the report of the visiting team is read to representatives of the school being evaluated. Copies of the typed report, which includes verification of data, documentary statements, additional descriptive material, and an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the program, are sent to the school for review and any necessary corrections of factual data.

The decision as to whether or not a program in nursing will be accredited rests with the board of review for that particular program. Members of review boards, appointed by the executive committee, are chosen from faculties and educational units offering NLN-accredited programs. In the evaluation of programs, each board of review is responsible for the application of criteria approved by the related council. As a basis for its evaluation, the board uses the self-evaluation report of the school, the school catalogue, and the report of the visiting team. The Board of Review for Associate Degree Programs must have agreement of a majority of its members on action taken on programs under review. The other three boards require a three-quarters vote of their members. Choice of action by a board is represented by the following motions:

1. *That the program be given initial or continued accreditation—*
   a. With recommendations
   b. Without recommendations
   c. With a request for a progress report within a specified period of time
   d. With warning and a time limit (used only in connection with continued accreditation)
   e. With other specified conditions or combinations of the above.
2. *That initial accreditation be deferred for a specified time pending receipt of additional evidence based on one or more of the following:*
   a. A progress report indicating fulfillment of recommendations
   b. A supplementary visit
   c. A meeting of representatives of the unit with the board
   d. Other specified conditions or combinations of the above.
3. *That initial accreditation be denied.*
   When this action is taken, the board of review identifies the criteria that have not been met and makes recommendations to assist the unit to meet them. Except in the case of a diploma program, the unit has the privilege of reapplying for accreditation without a revisit within the next two years.
4. *That accreditation be withdrawn.*
   When this action is taken, the board of review identifies the criteria that are not being met and makes recommendations to assist the unit to meet them. The unit has the privilege of applying for accreditation whenever it feels it is ready and proceeds as for initial accreditation.

Associate degree programs and baccalaureate and higher degree programs are revisited every eight years; diploma programs and practical nursing programs, every six years.

A program that has been denied initial or continuing accreditation may appeal the decision before a panel representing the executive committee of the appropriate council of agency members, which can either uphold the decision or refer the program again to the Board of Review.

A list of all accredited nursing programs is published annually in *Nursing Outlook*.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Criteria for the evaluation of programs in nursing adopted by the respective councils are contained in *Criteria for the Evaluation of Educational Programs in Nursing Leading to an Associate Degree, Criteria for the Appraisal of Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs in Nursing, Criteria for the Evaluation of Diploma Programs in Nursing, and Criteria for the Evaluation of Educational Programs in Practical Nursing.*

To be eligible for NLN accreditation, a program must be offered by an institution legally authorized to grant the degree, diploma, or certificate to which the program leads and must have graduated, or be near to graduating, its first class of students. The individuality of institutions and their special contributions are considered to be of paramount importance. Consequently, emphasis is placed upon the evaluation of the total program and its general excellence as well as upon its achievement with regard to its stated objectives.

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS

FORESTRY

Overview

The Committee on Accreditation, the accrediting body of the Society of American Foresters, has three practitioners out of a total of seven members.

Standards are developed by the Committee on Educational Policies, an eight-member group consisting of two representatives from the private sector of professional forestry, two from the public sector, two professional forestry educators, one staff member, and the chairman of the Committee on Accreditation. The standards are at present under review, and those now in effect may be out of date later this year.

Visiting teams must have one practitioner.

Constituency of Accrediting Body

The Committee on Accreditation consists of four accredited forestry school faculty members and three professional foresters. The director of Professional Programs of the Society serves as a nonvoting staff liaison member.

Responsibility of Accrediting Body

The Committee on Accreditation is responsible for evaluating applications from forestry schools for accredited status and making recommendations to the Council.

Procedures Used in Accreditation

A forestry school desiring accreditation is first requested to prepare a

self-evaluation report providing detailed information on its program. The Committee on Accreditation reviews the report and, if a visit is justified, appoints a visiting team of three members—an educator, a practitioner, and normally a staff member. A nonforester generalist is added to the team when the visit is not part of a regional accreditation association visit.

The visiting team inspects the institution and conducts interviews with faculty members, students, administrators, and others to determine if it meets the minimum standards set by the Society for physical and instructional facilities, faculty, financial support, etc. The forestry school is evaluated on the basis of its intramural stature and degree of autonomy relative to the parent institution, its faculty, curriculum, academic standards, competence of students, financial support, etc. After a study and evaluation of all the different factors involved, the Committee submits recommendations to the Council, which makes the final decision on accreditation.

The normal interval between reexaminations of previously accredited institutions is ten years, but this can be shortened at the discretion of the Committee on Accreditation.

A list of accredited schools appears in agency publications.

Policy Statements, Guidelines, or Principles Adhered to by Accrediting Body

Criteria for accreditation, established by the Council, are contained in *Bases for Accreditation of Professional Forestry Education Programs*, published in 1965.

The institution in which a professional forestry school is located must be accredited by its regional association and must have offered a program leading to a bachelor's or master's degree with a major in forestry for five years prior to accreditation. For the last two of these five years, the forestry program must have met the minimum accreditation standards of the Society. The overall program of the institution must be of such breadth and depth as to provide an environment conducive to the intellectual development of the student in all aspects of life.

Objectives of accreditation are to identify forestry schools that meet the minimum standards for professional forestry education and to provide guidance to university administrators in improving their forestry education programs. The Society recognizes the right of an institution to be appraised in the light of its stated purposes, provided that these purposes fall within the definition of general quality established by the Society for forestry accreditation. There is no desire to restrict the creative freedom of individual institutions in developing educational programs.

ADDRESS LIST

Accrediting Commission on Graduate Education for Hospital Administration
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 420
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
101 North Skinker Boulevard, Prince Hall
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

American Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada
534 Third National Building
Dayton, Ohio 45402

American Bar Association, Consultant on Legal Education
University of Texas
2500 Red River
Austin, Texas 78712

American Chemical Society, Committee on Professional Training
343 State Street
Rochester, New York 14650

American Council on Education for Journalism, Accrediting Committee
Northwestern University, 215 Fisk Hall
Evanston, Illinois 60201

American Council on Pharmaceutical Education
77 West Washington Street
Chicago, Illinois 60602

American Dental Association, Council on Dental Education
211 East Chicago Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

American Home Economics Association
2010 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Library Association, Committee on Accreditation
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

American Medical Association, Council on Medical Education
535 North Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610

American Optometric Association, Council on Optometric Education
7000 Chippewa Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63119

American Osteopathic Association, Bureau of Professional Education
212 East Ohio Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

American Podiatry Association, Council on Podiatry Education
20 Chevy Chase Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20015

American Psychological Association, Education and Training Board
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Public Health Association, Professional Education
1015 Eighteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Society of Landscape Architects
1750 Old Meadow Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

American Speech and Hearing Association, Education and Training Board
9030 Old Georgetown Road
Washington, D.C. 20014

American Veterinary Medical Association, Scientific Activities
600 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60605

Association of American Law Schools
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 370
Washington, D.C. 20036

Council on Social Work Education, Division of Education Standards and Accreditation
345 East 46th Street
New York, New York 10017

Engineers' Council for Professional Development
345 East 47th Street
New York, New York 10017

Liaison Committee on Medical Education
535 North Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610

National Architectural Accrediting Board
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

National Association for Industrial Technology
School of Technology, Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

National Association of Schools of Art, Commission on Accrediting
College of Architecture and Design
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

National Association of Schools of Music
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 650
Washington, D.C. 20036

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

National League for Nursing, Department of Baccalaureate and Higher Degree Programs
10 Columbus Circle
New York, New York 10019

Society of American Foresters
1010 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

1. ORGANIZATIONAL ELEMENTS OF RECOGNIZED ACCREDITING AGENCIES

ACCREDITING AGENCY	SIZE OF ACCREDITING BODY	AGENCY SELECTING REPRESENTATIVES & NUMBER APPOINTED	EDUCATORS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	PRACTITIONERS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	LAY, PUBLIC OR OTHER MEMBERS	NOTES
Accrediting Assn. of Bible Clgs.	8	Accrediting Assn. of Bible Clgs. (8)	8	None	None	Plans are being formulated to add public or lay members.
Accrediting Bur. for Medical Lab. Schools	9	Accredited Schools (3) Amer. Med. Tech. (3) Selected by Accrediting Bur. (3)	4 (see notes)	3	1-Hosp. Adm. 1-Dept. head, Medical Sch.	Educators include 1 professor of chemistry & 1 M.D. pathologist. Practitioners include 1 D.O. pathologist.
Accrediting Comm. for Business Schools	13	Elected by Inst. (9) United Business Schools Assn. (4)	9	-	4-Businessmen or educators from public & nonprofit higher edu.	This will be the composition following a reorganizational transition period.
Accrediting Comm. for Graduate Programs in Hospital Admin.	7	Amer. Clg. of Hosp. Adm. (1) Amer. Hosp. Assn. (1) Amer. Pub. Health Assn. (1) Assn. of Univ. Programs in Hosp. Adm. (4)	4	2 (see notes)	1-Medical educator	At least two practitioners are always members of the Commission.
Amer. Assn. of Collegiate Schools of Business, Operations Committee & Accreditation Council	5	Amer. Assn. of Collegiate Sch. of Business (5)	4	(see notes)	1-Nonacademic representative (see notes)	1 Nonacademic member is required by bylaws; may be from government, foundations, associations, business, or industry.
Amer. Assn. of Nurse Anesthetists, Board of Trustees	9	Amer. Assn. of Nurse Anesthetists (9)	3 (see notes)	6	None	All educators are practitioners.
Amer. Assn. of Theological Schools, Comm. on Accrediting	9	Amer. Assn. of Theological Sch. (9)	8	1	None	Generalists from regional associations participate in some visits.
Amer. Bar Assn., Council of the Section of Legal Education & Admission to the Bar	18	Amer. Bar Assn. (18)	4	11	3-Members or past members of state bds. of bar examiners	Council recommends to ABA House of Delegates which takes final action on accredited status, procedures, & standards. Bylaws do not specify composition of Counc.
Amer. Chemical Society, Comm. on Professional Training	9	Amer. Chemical Society (9)	8	1	None	Composition of Committee not specified in ACS Bylaws.

ACCREDITING AGENCY	SIZE OF ACCREDITING BODY	AGENCY SELECTING REPRESENTATIVES & NUMBER APPOINTED	EDUCATORS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	PRACTITIONERS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	LAY, PUBLIC OR OTHER MEMBERS	NOTES
Amer. Council on Education for Journalism, Accrediting Comm.	23	Amer. Council on Edu. for Journalism (23)	9 (27 votes)	14 (26 votes)	None	ACEJ consists of 17 assn's. in the field of mass communications, all of which have voting representation on the Council.
Amer. Council on Pharmaceutical Education	10	Amer. Assn. of Clgs. of Pharm. (3) Amer. Council on Education (1) Amer. Pharm. Assn. (3) Nat'l. Assn. of Bds. of Pharm. (3)	3	3 (see notes)	1-ACE appointee is a clg. or univ. adm. 3-State licensure board members	Attempts are made to appoint persons with past or present affiliations with education, but not necessarily limited to pharmaceutical education.
Amer. Dental Assn., Council on Dental Education	9	Amer. Assn. of Dental Examiners (3) Amer. Assn. of Dental Schools (3) Amer. Dental Assn. (3)	3	3	3-Appointees of AADE are state licensure authorities	Committees of ADA submit recommendations on matters of policy & accredited status for dental auxiliary programs; their membership includes representatives of the dental auxiliary fields.
Amer. Home Economics Assn., Council for Professional Development	13 vot'g., 2 ex-officio without vote	Institutional members of AHEA (6) Amer. Home. Econ. Assn. (6) Amer. Dietetics Assn. (1)	10	3	None	Accreditation criteria & procedures must be ratified by institutional members.
Amer. Library Assn., Comm. on Accreditation	10	Amer. Library Assn. (10)	5	5	None	Council of ALA approves standards upon recommendation of the Committee on Accreditation & Executive Bd.
Amer. Medical Assn., Council on Medical Education	10	Amer. Medical Assn. (10)	Balance is sought between educators & practitioners.		None	The CME of AMA relies extensively on an advisory committee for allied health education. It has a diversified membership. It also collaborates with review committees composed of medical doctors & allied health professionals. The AMA House of Delegates approves standards. Interested parties may react to accreditation policy through AMA Reference Committee process.

Reasonable balance is sought between educators & practitioners.

ACCREDITING AGENCY	SIZE OF ACCREDITING BODY	AGENCY SELECTING REPRESENTATIVES & NUMBER APPOINTED	EDUCATORS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	PRACTITIONERS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	LAY, PUBLIC OR OTHER MEMBERS	NOTES
Amer. Optometric Assn., Council on Optometric Education	7	Amer. Optometric Assn. (3) Assn. of Schools & Clgs. or Optometry (see notes) (2) International Assn. of Boards of Examiners in Optometry (2)	2	3	2-Members of State Boards of Examiners in Optometry	ASCO & IAB nominate four members each; two are selected by AOA.
Amer. Osteopathic Assn., Bur. of Professional Education	10	Amer. Osteopathic Assn. (10)	4 1 who is both a practitioner and educator. (See note under Lay, Public & other Members)	5	NOTE: One of the educators is president of Nat'l. Bd. of Examiners for Osteopathic Physicians & Surgeons	Bur. of Professional Education accepts recommendations from the AOA Comm. on Clgs. AOA Bd. of Trustees takes final approval action. The accredited clgs. nominate 1 person for membership on the Bureau.
Amer. Podiatry Assn., Council on Podiatry Education	10	Amer. Assn. of Clgs. of Podiatric Medicine (see notes) (2) Amer. Podiatry Assn. (7) Federation of Podiatry Bds. (see notes) (1)	2	7	1-Federation of Podiatry State Bd. Examiners	The APA House of Delegates approves standards. AACPM & FPB nominate & House of Delegates elect CPR members. By-laws changes under consideration will add 1 student & 1 lay member to the Council.
Amer. Psychological Assn., Comm. on Accreditation (see notes)	7	Amer. Psychological Assn. (7)	(4) (Most educators also engage in professional practice)	(2)	None	COA actions are reviewed by the Education & Training Bd. & by the APA Bd. of Directors. APA will add lay or public member during 1973.
Amer. Public Health Assn., Exec. Board (see notes)	16	Amer. Public Health Assn. (16)	8	8 (Some practitioners teach part time)	None - Board also includes 2 ex-officio members who are public health educators	Council on Health Manpower reviews VT reports & makes recommendations. CHM presents recommendations to Exec. Bd. for final action. Accrediting organization & procedures of APHA are under revision.
Amer. Society of Landscape Architects, Board of Landscape Architectural Accreditation	15	Amer. Society of Landscape Architects (15)	10	5	None	Schools nominate educators; ASLA chapters nominate practitioners.
Amer. Speech & Hearing Assn., Amer. Boards of Examiners in Speech Pathology & Audiology (see notes)	9	Amer. Speech & Hearing Assn. (9)	5	3	1-Public Member, to be added March, 1973	The ABESPA delegates routine accrediting matters to Education & Training Bd.

ACCREDITING AGENCY	SIZE OF ACCREDITING BODY	AGENCY SELECTING REPRESENTATIVES & NUMBER APPOINTED	EDUCATORS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	PRACTITIONERS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	LAY, PUBLIC OR OTHER MEMBERS	NOTES
Amer. Veterinary Medical Assn., Council on Education	12	Amer. Veterinary Medical Assn. (12)	4	4	3-Employees of government agencies 1-Vet. Medical Researcher (see notes)	All Council members must be active members of AVMA. Accreditation policy & standards must be approved by AVMA House of Delegates.
Assn. of Amer. Law Schools, Exec. Comm.	6	Assn. of Amer. Law Schools (6)	6	None	None	The membership of the Assn. takes final action on all accrediting decisions upon recommendation of the Exec. Comm. which in turn bases its recommendations on actions of Comm. on Accreditation.
Assn. for Clinical Pastoral Education, Comm. on Certification and Accreditation	20	Regional Org. of Assn. for Clinical Pastoral Education (9) Assn. for Clinical Pastoral Edu., House of Delegates (see notes) (11)	18 All clinical pastoral educators are also practitioners		2-from Theological Schools	House of Delegates elects upon nominations by ACPE regional organizations. Hosp. administrators, social workers & related professions have served on the CCA.
Cosmetology Accrediting Comm.	17	Accredited Schools (9) Professional Assns. (4) in Cosmetology (see notes) Cosmetology Accredit-(4) ing Comm.	9	4	4-General educators associated with public educational insts.	Nominated by Professional Assns. Cosmetology; elected by accredited schools
Council on Social Work Education, Comm. on Accreditation	17	Council on Social Work Education (17)	11	3	2-Graduate students in Social Work 1-Univ. Administrator	
Engineers' Council for Professional Development, Engineering Education & Accreditation Comm. (see notes)	34	12 participating & 2 affiliated engr. societies share 20 appointments on the basis of number of curricula accredited in their respective fields. 4-at-large appointments are reserved for societies not having specific curricula involvement or the required minimum of accredited curricula.	21	2	1-National Council for Engr. Examiners, who is an engr. educator	Executive Comm. of BCPD takes final action on recommendations by EE&A. If Exec. Comm. vote is not unanimous, final action is taken by full Bd. of Directors. Participating engr. societies approve members that are elected to EE&A by BCPD Bd. of Directors after nomination by the Committee.

ACCREDITING AGENCY	SIZE OF ACCREDITING BODY	AGENCY SELECTING REPRESENTATIVES & NUMBER APPOINTED	EDUCATORS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	PRACTITIONERS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	LAY, PUBLIC OR OTHER MEMBERS	NOTES
Liaison Comm. on Medical Education	14	Assn. of Amer. Med. Clgs. (To represent perspective of med. education) (6) Council on Med. Education, Amer. Med. Assn. (To represent perspective of Med. practice) (6) Liaison Comm. (2)	AMA-AAMC Appointees currently distributed as follows: 1-Hosp. adm., 2-M.D. practitioners, 1-M.D. adm. of semi-public agency related to med. education, 1-prof. of clinical medicine, 1-prof. of basic bio-med science, 4-medical school deans, 1-med. school dean-univ. vice-pres., 1-univ. vice pres.		1-Public member 1-Federal Gov't. official	To meet statutory provisions for licensure in some states. Liaison Comm. actions must be ratified by CME of AMA and/or the AAMC.
Nat'l. Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.	11	Amer. Inst. of Architects (2) Nat'l. Council of Architectural Registration Bds. (2) Assn. of Collegiate Schools of Arch. (3) Assn. of Student Chapters of AIA (1)	2	2	1-Generalist edu. 2-Related design professionals 1-Grad. student 1-Undergrad. stds. 2-State bd. members who are also practitioners	NAAB selects generalist & related design professionals. AIA, ACSA, NCARB & ASC/AIA make nominations. Undergrad. is nominated by ASC of AIA. ACSA nominates grad. student. President of AIA appoints from the list of nominees.
Nat'l. Assn. for Practical Nurse Edu. & Service Inc., Accrediting Review Board	7	Nat'l. Assn. for Practical Nurse Edu. & Service, Inc. (7)	6	None (see notes)	1-Generalist Educator (after April, 1973)	NAPNES' Edu. Committee sets accrediting policy & delegates the administration to the ARB; A practitioner is a member of the Education Committee.
Nat'l. Assn. of Schools of Art, Comm. on Accrediting	7	Nat'l. Assn. of Schools of Art (7)	7	None	1-Public Member to be added during 1972-1973	Actions of the Comm. ratified by the Assn. Bd. of Directors.
Nat'l. Assn. of Schools of Music						Both commissions administer the accreditation process & recommend action to the NASM Bd. of Directors & the Assn. membership.
Comm. on Undergrad. Studies	7	Nat'l. Assn. of Schools of Music (7)	7	None	None	
Comm. on Graduate Studies	7	Nat'l. Assn. of Schools of Music (7)	7	None	None	
Nat'l. Assn. of Trade & Technical Schools	9	Nat'l. Assn. of Trade & Technical Schools (9)	5	N/A	4-Generalist educators from outside private occupational schools	

ACCREDITING AGENCY	SIZE OF ACCREDITING BODY	AGENCY SELECTING REPRESENTATIVES & NUMBER APPOINTED	EDUCATORS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	PRACTITIONERS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	LAY, PUBLIC OR OTHER MEMBERS	NOTES
Nat'l. Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education	22	Amer. Assn. of Clgs. for Teacher Edu. (10) Nat'l. Edu. Assn. (6) Nat'l. Learned Societies (see notes) (3) Council of Chief State Sch. Off's. (1) Nat'l. Assn. of State Directors of Teach. Edu. & Certif. (1) Nat'l. Sch. Bd. Assn. (1)	10(usually)	6	3-Generalist Educators 1-Chief State Sch. Officer 1-Sch. Bd. Member 1-State Director of Teacher Certif.	Nat'l. Learned Societies appoint members on a rotating basis.
Nat'l. Home Study Council, Accrediting Comm.	9	Nat'l. Home Study Council (9)	4	N/A	3-Generalist Educators 2-Businessmen	Bylaws require 5 commissioners be from outside the home study field from areas such as business, colleges, public schools, government or vocational educators.
Nat'l. League for Nursing						The NLN Bd. of Directors delegates responsibility for accreditation to the 4-councils. The Councils are autonomous with respect to establishing standards & accrediting procedures, & the appointment of Boards of Review which have final authority for decisions related to the accredited status of programs. NLN has approx. 10% non-nurse membership.
Council for Baccalaureate & Higher Deg. Programs	9	Nat'l. League for Nurs'g. (9)	9	None	None	
Council of Diploma Programs	7	Nat'l. League for Nurs'g. (7)	7	None	None	
Council of Assoc. Deg. Prog.	7	Nat'l. League for Nurs'g. (7)	7	None	None	
Council of Practical Nurs'g. Programs.	7	Nat'l. League for Nurs'g. (7)	7	None	None	
Society of Amer. Foresters, Comm. on Accreditation	7	Soc. of Amer. Foresters (7)	4	3	None	The SAF Council gives final approval to standards & accredited status of programs.

ACCREDITING AGENCY	SIZE OF TEAM	EDUCATORS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	PRACTITIONERS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED		LAY, PUBLIC, OR OTHER MEMBERS	
REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS						
Middle States Assn. of Clgs. & Secondary Schools, Comm. on Higher Education	17	Middle States Assn. of Clgs. & Secondary Sch. (17)	16	N/A	1-Secondary School Educator	2-lay observers participate without vote in the proceedings of the Commission.
New England Assn. of Schools Clgs. Comm., on Institutions of Higher Education	14	New England Assn. of Schools & Clgs. (14)	14	N/A	None	Plans are being formulated to appoint 6-public members to the Exec. Comm. of the Assn.
North Central Assn. of Clgs. & Secondary Schools, Comm. on Institutions of Higher Education	68	North Central Assn. of Clgs. & Secondary Schools (68)	65	N/A	3-Secondary School Educators	Size of Comm. varies according to formula providing for geographic distribution & distribution by type of institution.
Northwest Assn. of Secondary & Higher Schools, Comm. on Higher Schools	23	Northwest Assn. Secondary & Higher Schools (2_)	23	N/A	None	
Southern Assn. of Clgs. & Schools, Comm. on Colleges	54	Southern Assn. of Clgs. & Schools (54)	43	N/A	11-Superintendents of Elementary or Secondary School Systems	The Comm. recommends to the Clg. Delegate Assembly, which takes final action. The CDA is composed of 1-representative from each accredited institution.
Western Assn. of Schools & Clgs., Accrediting Comm. for Jr. Clgs.	12	Calif. Jr. Clg. Assn. (6) Pres. Univ. of Hawaii (1) WASC, Accrediting Comm. for Secondary Schools (1) WASC, Accrediting Comm. for Sr. Clgs. & Univ. (1) Bd. of Governors of Calif. Comm. Clgs. (1) Northwest Assn. of Secondary & Higher Schools, Comm. on Higher Schools (1) WASC (Member with trustee experience) (1)	8	N/A	1-Secondary Sch. Educator 1-Sr. Clg. Educator 1-Staff member from office of State Chancellor of Comm. Clgs. 1-Lay member	One public member will be appointed to the Comm. effective July 1, 1973.
Western Assn. of Schools & Clgs., Accrediting Comm. for Sr. Clgs. & Univ.	14	Western Clg. Assn. (12) WASC, Accrediting Comm. for Jr. Clgs. (1) WASC, Accrediting Comm. for Secondary Schools (1)	12	N/A	1-Secondary School Educator 1-Jr. Clg. Educator	

2. COMPOSITION OF SITE VISIT TEAMS OF RECOGNIZED ACCREDITING AGENCIES

ACCREDITING AGENCY	SIZE OF TEAM	EDUCATORS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	PRACTITIONERS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	LAY, PUBLIC, OR OTHER MEMBERS
Accrediting Assn. of Bible Clgs.	3 to 5	Usually all	None	Generalists from regionally accredited institutions sometimes accompany VT.
Accrediting Bur. for Medical Lab. Schools	3 to 4	1-Usually a Staff member	1	1-Generalist Educator; 1-Financial Specialist
Accrediting Comm. for Business Schools	Minimum of 2-Bus. Sch. 3-Jr. Clgs. 4-Sr. Clgs.	1-Bus. Sch. 2-Jr. Clgs. 2-Sr. Clgs.	None	1-Business school; 1-Jr. clg; 2-Sr. clg; usually faculty or administrators from regionally accredited institutions.
Accrediting Comm. for Graduate Education in Hospital Adm.	4	Always 2; Sometimes 3	1-Sometimes	1 Staff Member
Amer. Assn. of Collegiate Schools of Business	2 to 5 3-Usually	2		1-Nonacademic participant. Generalist may accompany team at request of institution; staff members participate
Amer. Assn. of Nurse Anesthetists	1 or 2	1-Always	1-Usually	Generalist sometimes accompanies team.
Amer. Assn. of Theological Schools	2 to 8	Usually all	Sometimes use practitioners	Generalists from regionally accredited institutions sometimes accompany VT.
Amer. Bar. Assn.	2 to 4	1-Always	1-Always	Usually 1-legal librarian; sometimes 1 social scientist.
Amer. Chemical Society	1	Nearly always an educator 1	None	
Amer. Council on Education for Journalism	3 to 6	Always a majority of educators; always one practitioner.		Generalist at the request of institution.
Amer. Council on Pharmaceutical Education	2	1-Staff Member (a pharmaceutical educator) and 1-Council Member who may be either an educator or practitioner.		1-Member of State Board of Pharmacy participates as an observer. Generalist educator appointed by regionals sometimes participates.
Amer. Dental Assn. Dental Schools Dental Auxiliary Programs	5 2	3 1-Dental Aux. Educator; 1 ADA Council Member	1-Always	1-University Finance Officer. Specialists as needed. State Board is invited to send a representative. 2-ADA staff members accompany team on dental school visits; 1-staff member may accompany team for dental auxiliary visit.
Amer. Home Economics Assn.	4 to 5	3 or 4	1 or 2	AHEA Staff Member accompanies team.
Amer. Library Assn.	3 to 4	3-Usually	1-Always	None
Amer. Medical Assn.	2 to 4	Half of team is either a technologist-educator or technologist-practitioner		Usually 1 related Medical Specialist; usually 1 AMA Staff Member.
Amer. Optometric Assn.	4 to 7	1-Always 3-Sometimes	2	Usually 1-Examining Board Member; usually 1-Generalist Educator; 1 Staff Member.

ACCREDITING AGENCY	SIZE OF TEAM	EDUCATORS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	PRACTITIONERS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	LAY, PUBLIC, OR OTHER MEMBERS
Amer. Osteopathic Assn.[5]	12 to 14	7 to 8	4 to 5	1-Generalist Educator; 1-Staff Member.
Amer. Podiatry Assn.	5	1-Must be an educator	2-Usually are practitioners	1-Generalist Educator; 1-APA Staff Member.
Amer. Psychological Assn.	3 to 5	4	1	None
Amer. Public Health Assn.[3]	5	1 1 Member of Council on Health Manpower who may be either an educator or practitioner	1	1-Generalist Educator appointed by Regional Assn.; 1-APHA Staff Member.
Amer. Society for Landscape Architects	3	2	1	Generalist sometimes accompanies VT.
Amer. Speech & Hearing Assn.	2	2	None	Occasionally an observer of The Amer. Boards of Examiners in Speech Pathology and Audiology accompanies the team.
Amer. Veterinary Med. Assn.	5 to 7	Educator-practitioner balance is not a primary consideration. Two are selected from basic sciences, two from clinical sciences. Usually this results in two educators and two practitioners.		1-AVMA Staff Member; 1-Observer (frequently from Canadian Veterinary Medical Assn.); 1-Generalist (frequently).
Assn. of Amer. Law Schools	3 to 4	2-Usually	1-Usually	(Experimenting with including scholars outside the field of law).
Assn. for Clinical Pastoral Education	2 to 5 3-Usually	All (All educators are practitioners.)		None
Cosmetology Accrediting Comm.	3	1	1	1-Generalist Educator who serves as Chairman.
Council on Social Work Education, Comm. on Accreditation	3 to 4	All-Usually	1-Sometimes	Representatives of states sometimes accompany team as observers.
Engineers' Council for Professional Development	1-per curriculum plus 1	50%	50%	None
Liaison Comm. on Medical Education	2 to 6	Alway 1-educator and 1-practitioner. Other members may either be practitioners, medical educators, hospital administrators, or basic medical scientists.		1-Secretary of VT who either is AMA or AAMC staff member.
Nat'l. Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.	4	1 3	1	1-State Registration Board Member; 1-Student; 1- Generalist if requested by institution.
Nat'l. Assn. for Practical Nurse Education & Service, Inc.	2	2	None	None

ACCREDITING AGENCY	SIZE OF TEAM	EDUCATORS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	PRACTITIONERS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	LAY, PUBLIC, OR OTHER MEMBERS
Nat'l. Assn. of Sch. of Art	2 to 3	All	None	None
Nat'l. Assn. of Sch. of Mus.	1 to 2	All	None	None
Nat'l. Assn. of Trade & Tech. Schools	3 to 12	1-Minimum; others as needed	1-Minimum (or employer)	1-Commissioner or NATTS Staff Member. Consumer protection agencies and local or state education officials are invited to accompany VT.
Nat'l. Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Edu.	6 to 10 Add'l. persons for branch campuses	4-Minimum	2-Minimum	State Department representative is invited to accompany team. State Teachers Assn. may send observer if institution consents.
Nat'l. Home Study Council	4-Minimum	1-Minimum (VT Chairman and 1-business operations specialist, who may or may not be home study educators.)	N/A	1-Accrediting Commission member or staff person
Nat'l. League for Nursing (All Councils)	2	2	None	None
Soc. of Amer. Foresters	4	1	1	1-SAF Staff Member; 1-Generalist Educator.

ACCREDITING AGENCY	SIZE OF TEAM	EDUCATORS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	PRACTITIONERS FROM THE FIELD BEING ACCREDITED	LAY, PUBLIC, OR OTHER MEMBERS
REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS[6]				
Middle States Assn. of Clgs. & Secondary Schools	6 or more	All	N/A	Secondary School educators sometimes accompany VT.
New England Assn. of Schools & Clgs.	4 to 10	All	N/A	None
North Central Assn. of Clgs. & Secondary Schools	4 or more	All	N/A	Experimenting with laity & students as members of VT.
Northwest Assn. of Secondary & Higher Schools	6 to 16	All	N/A	None
Southern Assn. of Clgs. & Schools	5 or more; 9-Average	All	N/A	State-level education officials accompany teams in some instances.
Western Assn. of Schools & Clgs; Jr. Clg. Comm.	5 to 11	All (except as noted under "Lay, Public, or Other.")	N/A	1-Staff Member, Board of Governors of Calif. Jr. Clgs. Some Jr. Clg. Board Members are being used.
Western Assn. of Schools & Clgs, Sr. Clg. Comm.	3 to 10	All	N/A	None

[1] ASC does not always send a visiting associate. Any decisions about the necessity or desirability of a visit as a part of an evaluation is made following an informal conference with the department chairman, or, in the case of re-evaluation of institutions already on the ACS approved list, after a careful study of the re-evaluation questionnaire data submitted by the department chairman.

[2] These are interim measures being tried by APHA during extensive revision of its accreditation organization and operation.

[3] AMAB usually sends a five-member team for initial accreditation visits and frequently sends one to three-member teams for interim visits when matters of concern arise.

[4] At least two subject matter specialists review materials for each course offered by a home study school with reports going to the Accrediting Commission. They do not necessarily accompany the team.

[5] AOA sends survey teams for re-evaluation each six years. Interim visits are frequently conducted each two or three years with a five or six member team.

[6] The regional associations and some specialized agencies, mainly at the request of the institution, conduct joint accreditation visits. In addition, state agencies send observers or participants to accompany the regional association visiting team.

3. PROCEDURES FOLLOWED BY RECOGNIZED AGENCIES IN DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS AND MAJOR POLICIES

ACCREDITING AGENCY	INPUT SOUGHT FROM EXTERNAL PARTIES [1]	POLICY WOULD PERMIT EXTERNAL PARTY TO APPEAR AT AGENCY MEETING TO COMMENT	ACCREDITED INSTITUTION OR PROGRAM PRESENT [2]	NOTICE GIVEN THROUGH
Accrediting Assn. of Bible Clgs.	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Accrediting Bur. for Medical Lab. Schools	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail
Accrediting Comm. for Business Schools	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Accrediting Comm. for Grad. Education in Hospital Adm.	No	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail to accredited programs
Amer. Assn. of Collegiate Schools of Bus.	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Distb. of Board Minutes; Direct mail; agency publications
Amer. Assn. of Nurse Anesthetists	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Amer. Assn. of Theological Schools	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Amer. Bar Assn.	Unapprv'd schools; otherwise not from outside profession	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Amer. Chemical Society	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Agency publications
Amer. Council on Education for Journalism [3]	Not from outside the profession	No	Written & oral comments	Direct mail
Amer. Council on Pharmaceutical Education	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency and professional publications
Amer. Dental Assn. [4]	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; professional publications
Amer. Home Economics Assn.	Yes	Yes	Written comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Amer. Library Assn.	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Amer. Medical Assn.	Yes	Yes	Oral comments	Agency publications
Amer. Optometric Assn.	Not from outside the profession	Yes	Written comments	Direct mail
Amer. Osteopathic Assn.	Not from outside the profession	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Amer. Podiatry Assn.	Not from outside the profession	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail
Amer. Psychological Assn.	Not from outside the profession	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; professional journals
Amer. Public Health Assn.	Yes	No Policy	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Amer. Society of Landscape Architects	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Agency publications
Amer. Speech & Hearing Assn.	Yes	No Policy	Written comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Amer. Veterinary Medical Assn.	Not from outside the profession	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail
Assn. of Amer. Law Schools	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Assn. for Clinical Pastoral Education	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Cosmetology Accrediting Comm.	Yes	Yes	Written comments	Direct mail; agency publications

ACCREDITING AGENCY	INPUT SOUGHT FROM EXTERNAL PARTIES [1]	POLICY WOULD PERMIT EXTERNAL PARTY TO APPEAR AT AGENCY MEETING TO COMMENT	ACCREDITED INSTITUTION OR PROGRAM PRESENT [2]	NOTICE GIVEN THROUGH
Council on Social Work Education	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Engineers' Council for Professional Development	Yes	Yes	No special provisions for institutional participation	Direct mail; agency publications & professional journals
Liaison Comm. on Medical Education	No	No Policy	Assn. of Amer. Medical Clgs. receives oral & written comments	AMA & AAMC professional journals & publications
Nat'l. Architectural Accrediting Board	Not from outside the profession or the membership of NAAB.	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; professional journals
Nat'l. Assn. for Practical Nurse Education & Service, Inc.	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Nat'l. Assn. of Schools of Art	No	Yes	Written & oral comments	Minutes of Board meeting circulated to member schools
Nat'l. Assn. of Schools of Music	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; professional journals
Nat'l. Assn. of Trade & Technical Schools	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; professional journals
Nat'l. Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education[5]	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications & professional journals
Nat'l. Home Study Council	No	No	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Nat'l. League for Nursing	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Society of Amer. Foresters	Not from outside the profession	Yes	Written comments	Agency publications
REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS				
Middle States Assn. of Clgs. & Secondary Schools	No	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
New England Assn. of Schools & Clgs.	No	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
North Central Assn. of Clgs. & Secondary Schools	No	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Northwest Assn. of Secondary & Higher Schools	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Southern Assn. of Clgs. & Schools	No	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Western Assn. of Clgs. & Schools - Jr. Clg. Comm.	Yes	Yes	Written & oral comments	Direct mail; agency publications
Western Assn. of Clgs. & Schools - Sr. Comm.	No	No	Written & oral comments	Direct mail

[1] Parties external to the membership of the Accrediting Agency to include nonaccredited institutions or programs.

[2] In instances where oral comments are indicated, agency holds special meetings to discuss proposed changes.

[3] Most policies are adopted and then "announced."

[4] Many policies are adopted without prior notification.

[5] American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has responsibility for development of standards for teacher education.

4. INSTITUTIONAL OPPORTUNITY FOR INPUT IN DECISION MAKING ON ACCREDITED STATUS

ACCREDITING AGENCY	INSTITUTIONAL OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT IN WRITING ON ELEMENTS IN VISITING TEAM REPORT BEFORE DECISION IS REACHED				APPEARANCE OF REP. AT AGENCY MEETING CONSIDERING VT REPORT	AGENCY HAS STATED APPEALS PROCEDURE
	PROVIDED WITH COPY	FACTUAL ASPECTS	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	VISITING TEAMS RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACCREDITED STATUS		
Accrediting Assn. of Bible Clgs.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not included in VT Rpt. Inst. is consulted before negative decision is made	Upon request	Yes
Accrediting Bur. of Medical Lab. Schools	Yes	Yes	Yes	None made by VT	Upon request	Yes
Accrediting Comm. for Business Schools	Yes	Yes	VT Report does not include recommendations	None made by VT	Invited only if serious negative action is anticipated	Yes
Accrediting Comm. on Grad. Education for Hosp. Adm.	Yes	Yes	VT Report does not include recommendations	Report does not include VT recommendation	Upon request	Under Development
Amer. Assn. of Collegiate Schools of Business	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Invited to appear	Yes
Amer. Assn. of Nurse Anesthetists	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upon request	Yes
Amer. Assn. of Theological Schools	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	None	Yes
Amer. Bar. Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	[1]	Yes
Amer. Chemical Society	No	[1]			None	Yes
Amer. Council on Edu. for Journalism	No	Report read to institution at time of exit interview (Policy being revised)			None	Yes
Amer. Council on Pharmaceutical Education	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Upon request	Yes
Amer. Dental Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Upon request	Yes
Amer. Home Economics Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Upon request	Yes
Amer. Library Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes; Eff.1/73	Report does not include VT recommendation	None	Yes
Amer. Medical Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Upon request	Yes

ACCREDITING AGENCY	INSTITUTIONAL OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT IN WRITING ON ELEMENTS IN VISITING TEAM REPORT BEFORE DECISION IS REACHED: PROVIDED WITH COPY	FACTUAL ASPECTS	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	VISITING TEAMS RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACCREDITED STATUS	APPEARANCE OF REP. AT AGENCY MEETING CONSIDERING VT REPORT	AGENCY HAS STATED APPEALS PROCEDURE
Amer. Optometric Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Invited to appear	Yes
Amer. Osteopathic Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Invited to appear	Yes
Amer. Podiatry Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Invited to appear	Yes
Amer. Psychological Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Upon request	Yes
Amer. Public Health Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Invited to appear before Council on Health Manpower	Under development
Amer. Soc. of Landscape Architects	Yes	Yes	VT Report does not include recommendation	Report does not include VT recommendation	Upon request	Yes
Amer. Speech & Hearing Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	No policy	Yes
Amer. Veterinary Med. Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	No policy	Yes
Assn. of Amer. Law Schools	Yes	Yes	VT frequently does not make recommendations	VT frequently does not make recommendations	Upon request	Yes
Assn. for Clinical Pastoral Education	No	Report discussed with institution at time of exit interview			None	Yes
Cosmetology Accrediting Comm.	Yes	Yes	Yes	None made by VT	Upon request	Yes
Council on Social Work Education	Yes	Yes	Yes	None made by VT	None	Yes
Engineers' Council for Professional Development	No	Presented orally at time of exit interview		VT does not reveal recommendation in exit interview	None	Yes
Liaison Comm. on Med. Edu.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	None	Yes
Nat'l. Architectural Accrediting Board	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Invited to appear	Yes

ACCREDITING AGENCY	INSTITUTIONAL OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT IN WRITING ON ELEMENTS IN VISITING TEAM REPORT BEFORE DECISION IS REACHED				APPEARANCE OF REP. AT AGENCY MEETING CONSIDERING VT REPORT	AGENCY HAS STATED APPEALS PROCEDURE
	PROVIDED WITH COPY	FACTUAL ASPECTS	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	VISITING TEAMS RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACCREDITED STATUS		
Nat'l. Assn. for Practical Nurse Education & Service, Inc.	Yes	Yes	VT report does not include recommendation	VT makes no recommendation	No policy	Yes
Nat'l. Assn. of Schools of Art	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	None	Yes
Nat'l. Assn. of Schools of Music	No	1			Upon request	Yes
Nat'l. Assn. of Trade & Technical Schools	Yes	Yes	Yes	VT is not asked to make recommendation	Upon request	Yes
Nat'l. Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education	Yes	Yes	VT ordinarily makes no recommendations	VT makes no recommendations	Invited to appear	Yes
Nat'l. Home Study Counc.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Vt makes no recommendation	Upon request	Yes
Nat'l. League for Nursing (All councils)	Yes	Yes	Yes	VT makes no recommendation	Upon request	Yes
Soc. of Amer. Foresters	Yes	Yes	Yes	VT makes no recommendation	Upon request	Yes

ACCREDITING AGENCY	INSTITUTIONAL OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT IN WRITING ON ELEMENTS IN VISITING TEAM REPORT BEFORE DECISION IS REACHED					
	PROVIDED WITH COPY	FACTUAL ASPECTS	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	VISITING TEAMS RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACCREDITED STATUS	APPEARANCE OF REP. AT AGENCY MEETING CONSIDERING VT REPORT	AGENCY HAS STATED APPEALS PROCEDURE
REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS						
Middle States Assn. of Clgs. & Secondary Sch.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	None	Yes
New England Assn. of Schools & Clgs.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	None	Yes
North Central Assn. of Clgs. & Secondary Sch.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Invited to appear	Yes
Northwest Assn. of Secondary & Higher Sch.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Invited to appear	Yes
Southern Assn. of Clgs. & Schools	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Invited to appear on initial accreditation; invited on reevaluations only when negative decision is likely	Yes
Western Assn. of Schools & Clgs., Jr. Clg. Comm.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Invited to appear or respond in writing	Yes
Western Assn. of Schools & Clgs., Sr. Comm.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Report does not include VT recommendation	Invited to appear or respond in writing	Yes

[1] Both the president of the institution and the department chairman are notified of the conclusions of the Committee on Professional Training of ASC. In cases of approval, the institution is advised accordingly. The letter of notification may include suggestions for further improvement of the program. If approval is deferred or not recommended, the institution is advised of the reasons and is invited to keep the CPT advised of improvements and progress in eliminating program weaknesses.

[2] AALS has a detailed set of hearing procedures which the Association follows on academic freedom and tenure issues which have a major impact on the accredited status of a law school.

[3] The appropriate NASM Commission receives the visiting team report without comment from the institution. Affirmative recommendations are then acted upon by the NASM Board of Directors and the institution is notified. If the Commission does not forward an affirmative recommendation, the case is tabled until the institution can make improvements, present additional information, or respond to the Commission report. The Commission then forwards an affirmative or negative recommendation to the Board of Directors.

[4] The VT report initially goes directly to the NAAB, which considers the report and renders a tentative decision. The institution is then forwarded a copy, which includes notification of the tentative decision, and is afforded an opportunity to (1) comment on the report, and (2) send a representative to appear before the NAAB at its next meeting, at which time a final decision is rendered.

[5] A Committee on Accreditation reviews the VT report and frames a recommendation to the Council. If there are serious problems which require corrections, or if a negative decision appears warranted, an institutional representative will be invited to appear before the Council.

[6] Appeal is to AMA Council on Medical Education and/or the AAMC.